CPrnB COPY

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1999

## HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

**RALPH REGULA, Ohio, *Chairman***

JOSEPH M. McDADE, Pennsylvania
JIM KOLBE, Arizona
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., Washington
DAN MILLER, Florida
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee

SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
DAVID E. SKAGGS, Colorado
JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Livingston, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

DEBORAH WEATHERLY, LORETTA BEAUMONT, JOEL KAPLAN, and CHRISTOPHER TOPIK, *Staff Assistants*

---

### PART 10


| | Page |
|---|---|
| **Smithsonian Institution** | 3 |
| **National Gallery of Art** | 77 |
| **John F. Kennedy Center** | 87 |
| **National Endowment for the Arts** | 107 |
| **Woodrow Wilson Center** | 175 |
| **National Endowment for the Humanities** | 193 |
| **IMLS—Office of Museum Services** | 259 |
| **Commission of Fine Arts** | 277 |
| **Advisory Council on Historic Preservation** | 289 |
| **National Capital Planning Commission** | 325 |
| **Holocaust Memorial Council** | 357 |
| **Testimony of Members of Congress** | 373 |


---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1999

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1998.

## SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

### WITNESSES

I. MICHAEL HEYMAN, SECRETARY
CONSTANCE B. NEWMAN, UNDER SECRETARY
J. DENNIS O'CONNOR, PROVOST
MICHAEL H. ROBINSON, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Smithsonian Institution NEWS

## I. MICHAEL HEYMAN, SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

I. Michael Heyman became the 10th secretary of the Smithsonian Institution on Sept. 19, 1994. He heads a complex of 16 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park, as well as scientific and cultural research facilities in 10 states and the Republic of Panama.

Heyman served as chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley from 1980 to 1990. He began his career at Berkeley in 1959 as an acting professor of law and became a full professor in 1961. His distinguished teaching career has included service as a visiting professor of law at Yale (1963-1964) and at Stanford (1971-1972).

A strong leader and active fund-raiser, Heyman strengthened Berkeley's biosciences departments and successfully promoted ethnic diversification of the undergraduate student body while maintaining high academic standards. The university maintains several large museums and, as chancellor, he actively participated in their supervision.

He was counselor to Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt as well as deputy assistant secretary for policy at Interior from 1993 to 1994, and is a member of the state bars of California and New York.

Born on May 30, 1930, in New York City, Heyman was educated at Dartmouth College, earning a bachelor's degree in government in 1951. After a year in Washington as legislative assistant to Sen. Irving M. Ives of New York, he served in the United States Marines as a first lieutenant on active duty from 1951 to 1953, and as a captain in the reserves from 1953 to 1958.

Heyman received his juris doctor in 1956 from Yale University Law School, where he was editor of the Yale Law Journal. He was an associate with the firm of Carter, Ledyard and Milburn in New York City from 1956 to 1957. He was chief law clerk to Chief Justice Earl Warren from 1958 to 1959.

Over the years, Heyman has served on and chaired numerous boards and commissions, including almost four years as a member of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents (1990-1994). He has dedicated more than a decade of service to his alma mater—Dartmouth—as a member of its board of trustees from 1982 to 1993 and as chairman of the board from 1991 to 1993. Heyman also has been a member of the board of trustees of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law since 1977.

Heyman is married to Therese Thau Heyman, senior curator on leave from the Oakland Museum in California. Their son, James, is a physicist and teacher.

####

January 1998

NOTE TO EDITORS: For more information, contact David Umansky, (202) 357-2627 ext. 106.

## CONSTANCE BERRY NEWMAN

Constance Berry Newman became Under Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in July, 1992. She was Director of the Office of Personnel Management from June, 1989 to June, 1992. For more than 20 years she managed public and private organizations. Among her major management positions were: Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Director of VISTA, and President of the Newman & Hermanson Company. She was also Commissioner and Vice-Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

From 1987 to 1988, Ms. Newman worked for the Government of Lesotho as a Cooperative Housing Foundation consultant to advise the Ministry of Interior regarding the establishment of a housing corporation to receive World Bank funding.

During her public career which began in 1961, Ms. Newman worked both as a career public servant and a political appointee with four Presidential appointments, three of which were confirmed by the Senate.

Ms. Newman was a Woodrow Wilson Visiting Fellow from 1977 to 1985 and a member of the Adjunct Faculty at the Kennedy School, Harvard University from 1979 to 1982. She has received an Honorary Doctor of Laws from her Alma Mater, Bates College, Amherst College and Central State University. In addition to receiving an A.B. from Bates College, she received a Bachelor of Science in Law degree from the University of Minnesota Law School. In 1985, she received the Secretary of Defense Medal for Outstanding Public Service. At present she serves on the Board of Trustees of The Brookings Institution and Bates College and is a member of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

**J. DENNIS O'CONNOR**
**PROVOST, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION**

J. Dennis O'Connor joined the Smithsonian Institution in December 1995 as the Institution's first Provost (chief programs officer). He is responsible for central planning, integration and oversight of research, exhibitions and education of the largest museum and research complex in the world.

Dr. O'Connor is a prominent biologist and educational leader who came to the Smithsonian from the University of Pittsburgh, where he served as Chancellor from 1991 to 1995. A native of Chicago, he earned a bachelor's degree from Loyola University, a master's degree from DePaul University, and a Ph.D. from Northwestern University. Dr. O'Connor has served as Dean of the Life Sciences at the University of California, Los Angeles, and at the University of North Carolina, Vice Chancellor of Research and Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School, and as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost.

**Michael H. Robinson**
**Director, National Zoological Park**
**Smithsonian Institution**

Michael H. Robinson, Director of the Smithsonian Institution's National Zoological Park, is an animal behaviourist and a tropical biologist. Immediately prior to his appointment to the National Zoo in May 1984, Dr. Robinson served as Acting Director and Deputy Director of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama, which institution he joined in 1966 as a tropical biologist. He received his Doctor of Philosophy from Oxford University after being awarded his Bachelor of Science, Summa Cum Laude, from the University of Wales. His scientific interests include predator-prey interactions, evolution of adaptations, tropical biology, courtship and mating behaviour, and freshwater biology. He is the author of more than 130 scientific papers and articles including a book on the courtship and mating behaviour of spiders.

## OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. REGULA. We will get started with the committee hearing. I am pleased to welcome all of you from the Smithsonian. Your statements will be made a part of the record.

Secretary Heyman, if you would like to summarize for us.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir, I would. Thank you for the opportunity.

Last year was really a good one for us. We had over 30 million visits between the museums and the zoo here in Washington, and that was up 23 percent from the year previous. That says something about Washington, in general.

Mr. REGULA. A 23 percent increase in visitation?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. REGULA. Just think what that would do if you had a fee.

Mr. HEYMAN. That is what I thought you would say, sir. [Laughter.]

I walked right into that one, did I not?

We opened the Geology, Gems, and Minerals Exhibition, which is sterling. We had a host of other exhibitions that were very, very good. I do not have to go through all of them, just a couple. The Ansel Adams show, turned out to be, I think, the largest draw the American Art Museum has ever had. That museum is just crowded every day. Unfortunately, the show ends in about a week, but it has been wonderful, and that has been true throughout the whole of the Smithsonian. We have had really very fetching exhibitions.

## "AMERICA'S SMITHSONIAN"

"America's Smithsonian," that big traveling show, is now back. Its last stand will be and is in the Ripley Center, which gives people from the Washington area an opportunity to see it and gives staff at the Smithsonian an opportunity to see it. It drew over 3 million people when it went around the country. So it was exceedingly successful.

Mr. REGULA. Let me ask you, did you break even on cost?

Mr. HEYMAN. No, sir. We are still in the hole, but I trust that we will dig our way out considerably by a number of devices; one is the NOVUS credit card; the other is the possibility, although I am not sure yet how imminent, that we will do an international tour, which will be a profitable venture.

Mr. REGULA. International?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes. Not with the same artifacts, but with other materials from the Smithsonian. If that works well, that will be a nice offset against losses from "America's Smithsonian."

But I do not really look at them so much as losses as an investment, especially now that we have begun to be as successful as we are on the Web, which is really outreach, and as we have begun to be in the Affiliations Program with museums around the country.

So, in a sense, this kind of established us around the country and, perhaps, it will also prove to be very useful as we get into a capital campaign. It is a little hard to know, but it can be viewed in investment terms, I think, properly.

SMITHSONIAN HOME PAGE

Digitization remains a large priority for us, and you know in our budget we have a request for $3 million for the base to increase the amount of digitization we can do. The Web continues to enlarge. We are we getting over 12 million, close to 14 million—hits a month.

Mr. REGULA. A month?

Mr. HEYMAN. A month. It is, as you know, a very dense site with each of the museums and the research institutes having Home Pages under the Smithsonian Home Page. People spend a lot of time with us. It is not simply coming in and coming out. As far as we can determine, people are spending some significant time with us.

We are beginning to put exhibitions on the Web. The site has two presently and various museums have exhibits as well.

We are in the process of doing the first exhibition that I think was ever designed solely for the Web. It never existed other than on the Web, and it is going to open up new areas.

DIGITIZATION OF IMAGES

I detailed the digitization matters considerably in my written statement. It is obviously about access to our collections. The sums that we are getting from the Federal Government and hope we will have in hand are being combined with grants from IBM, and Intel, and Hewlett Packard.

Mr. REGULA. Give us an example of what you would digitize. I hear it is quite expensive to do.

Mr. HEYMAN. Where we are putting our attention right at the moment is a whole bunch of photographic images that are in the American History Museum. They are not all American History materials, but what else do they include, Dennis?

Dr. O'CONNOR. There is a lot of two-dimensional material, Mr. Chairman, that we will be digitizing. For example, as part of collection management, when an object comes in it is photographed. We can just simply take that photograph, scan it, and then it becomes part of a digital record that we can either use for collection management or we can use to put it up on the Web as part of a virtual exhibit.

So there are two-dimensional materials; photographs, negatives, art work, and then the more difficult task—and, indeed, you are correct, more expensive—will be to digitize three-dimensional images with the technology such that you can turn the image around to be able to see all sides of it.

Mr. REGULA. This would be on your Web site then.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. HEYMAN. It will be on our Web site, and it will be connected with our Collection Information Systems [CIS], so that it is going to be possible to find the images that you want.

When we finish combining the CIS materials from the various museums, you are going to be able to come in on subject matter, let us say American Indian, and you are going to be able to find what we have in all our museums under a single subject matter, so that you are not going to have to scan museum-by-museum in

order to find images, and the images will have with them the reference materials—essentially, the labels—that identify and explain the images.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Skaggs, we can be sort of informal this morning. So, if things occur to you, as we go along, do not hesitate.

Mr. SKAGGS. Thank you.

WEB ACCESS FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Mr. HEYMAN. And, obviously, we are using Web access for a number of educational programs. Natural Partners continues to expand. There are lesson plans on the Web now from a lot of the Smithsonian organizations. The Smithsonian Office of Education has posted a whole series of lesson plans——

Mr. REGULA. Teachers would pick this up?

Mr. HEYMAN [continuing]. That teachers can pick up and download, and then they can download materials, also, in support of the lesson plans.

Mr. REGULA. Do you have interactive potential, so that a school that is so wired could actually have an interactive classroom with the Smithsonian?

Mr. HEYMAN. Obviously, we do with Natural Partners. Now, what else are we doing presently?

Dr. O'CONNOR. The most significant interactive environment, Mr. Chairman, is the Natural Partners Program, and there is a downloading site, I believe, in many states of the Union, at least onesite.

Mr. REGULA. Then the schools can plug into that.

Dr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. REGULA. This has enormous potential.

Mr. HEYMAN. It has enormous potential. It also has a lot of problems that are going to have to be faced over time, not the least being that interactive electronic potential is interesting, but you have to have somebody on our side to be interactive with, and so that increases the load on curators and research people, many of whom are really quite willing and excited about doing it, but they cannot do it all of the time, obviously, and also do their jobs.

So sorting all of that out over time, for all institutions, not simply ours, is going to be a real challenge.

AFFILIATIONS PROGRAM

We are continuing the outreach of the Affiliations Program. You will recall the Affiliations Program is one in which the Smithsonian is entering into agreements with museums around the country. We are up to, I think, really nine now, or at least eight, where we have Memoranda of Understanding.

I look forward to this as probably the most interesting new activity of the Smithsonian that has occurred during the time that I have been Secretary because I think this has the potentiality over the next 10 or 15 years to spread all over the United States, with portions of the Smithsonian collection in many places which will give people access to those artifacts and will bolster the efforts of regional museums around the country.

I was worried whether our museums would want to be in a position to cooperate in this, but the ones that have so far been asked,

primarily, which are American History and Natural History, seem to have absorbed this level of activity well and are really getting interested in it.

The Provost has a small staff of people who are the facilitators, which is really critical for making these arrangements work.

The amount of publicity that the Smithsonian is getting in each of the venues, where agreements are being reached, is considerable, and the amount of notice, with respect to the programs that are occurring through the American Association of Museums and other like sources, is considerable.

So we have now got inquiries from organizations in 30 states, and we know that a number of those are going to work out over time. So it just keeps mounting in terms of the number of people picking up our invitation.

RESEARCH

The research continues apace at the Smithsonian. I do not have to go through it. I have that in my written testimony. But we have been doing, for instance, a lot of work on El Niño in Panama. That has been one of the places with drought, and it has been very interesting to view what has been occurring, as Dennis was telling me, with regard to the adaptation by plant life, even in a single year.

Up at SAO we are trying to find planets elsewhere than in our solar system, and so far we have found one. That discovery was made, I guess, at Arizona using the multiple-mirror telescope.

But there is an enormous amount going on.

Mr. REGULA. Would that be the new scope in Arizona that was put up on Mount Hopkins?

Mr. HEYMAN. This was found with the old one. When will the new one be in operation?

Dr. O'CONNOR. We just closed the multiple mirror, and the single mirror is due to arrive up on top of the mountain, hopefully, by April. The first light we are anticipating sometime in July.

Mr. HEYMAN. It is going to be a heck of an experience taking this huge single mirror up that mountain. As you might know, it is a very narrow trail that goes up, and there has been a lot of testing going on with respect to how to assure its safe arrival.

Mr. SKAGGS. Maybe we could visit, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be a good time.

Mr. HEYMAN. We would be delighted to have you visit there and then to visit the new site on Mauna Kea in Hawaii.

Mr. SKAGGS. That might be pushing our luck. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEYMAN. And then we are in a partnership in Chile on the Magellan Project.

Mr. SKAGGS. We might be in the vicinity. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEYMAN. It would be a delight. We would be really pleased if you came.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Choose an evening with a new moon, Mr. Skaggs, because with a full moon it is too light. The stars do not show well.

Mr. HEYMAN. One of the things that amazed me when I went was that people do not look directly at stars any more. They really see the stars on a television set, and that is the way they are received. The image is enhanced electronically. You could be sitting

here, and you could be looking at the same image that one is looking at right on the site.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Nowhere near as fun.

Mr. HEYMAN. No, nowhere near as fun.

Mr. REGULA. It's not like being on the site, though.

Mr. HEYMAN. We have five telescopes now that are dedicated to schools in the United States. I spoke about them once. They are through the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. Schools can sign up, and then once——

Mr. REGULA. Schools meaning colleges?

Mr. HEYMAN. Elementary schools and secondary schools, basically.

Mr. REGULA. Really?

Mr. HEYMAN. Secondary schools, more so junior high schools than high schools, but most of the astronomy that is offered at the K through 12 level is at the high school level.

But they can sign up, and then they can scan portions of the sky by prearrangement on these dedicated scopes, and then they get the results of that scanning back into the classroom over the Internet. It is an extraordinary opportunity with regard to being able to export experience in the manner that I was indicating, which is visually through the Internet.

So it is just expanding in all kinds of ways is the point, I guess, I am really seeking to make.

## SMITHSONIAN BUDGET REQUEST

Let me turn to the budget request. Our total budget request is $419.8 million. That is up about 4.4 percent from last year.

In salaries and expenses, we are asking for mandatories, and we have three program improvements that we are seeking; one of those is $3 million for digitization—the subject I was speaking about just recently. Some portion of that is for Natural History for relocation and moving in the East Wing, now that that is finishing, and for staffing in the West Wing. That is the wing that we are constructing with the proceeds of the bond that was successfully launched. So that is not being federally supported on that side.

And then $11 million for the NMAI—for the National Museum for the American Indian—to begin to support the move of artifacts from the Research Branch up in the Bronx down to the Cultural Resources Center in Suitland, Maryland. That will be a process that will take a while, obviously, because each of those items has to be conserved, and then packed, and then moved. So it is a real process and there is a lot to do with that.

So it is the move; it is the staffing up of the Cultural Resources Center in Suitland; and it is the beginning for exhibit design with regard to a Mall museum which, hopefully, will be up—what did we say?—2002, and for which, of course, we are seeking federal funding for the last portion of that.

We have requested $40 million, up $8 million for R&R. We still need, of course, the eventual $50 million so that we can be on a sustaining basis in relation to the analysis we have shown you in the past, and I hope we can be seeking that in the near future.

As far as construction is concerned, obviously, we are asking for the last portion of the National Museum of the American Indian,

and that is a bifurcated request; $16 million in terms of this fiscal year, an advanced appropriation of $19 million for next year. If both of those could occur presently, the probabilities are high that we would be able to start construction later in this fiscal year. That is the reason for including the advanced appropriation, as well as the appropriation for this time.

Then $2 million for minor construction and alterations and modifications in planning. We are requesting $4.5 million for the Zoo for construction. $3.8 million of that is really R&R, and then $700,000 is for planning in relationship to the Holt House, which is a minor amount, but a more major amount in terms of master planning.

CAPITAL PLANNING

Let me just say before I end my statement and invite your questions, that there are other buildings that we have been involved with; one, of course, is the Dulles Center, and we will have finished construction drawings, which are, at about 65 percent now, by next fall. We are hard at work seeking to raise money for that. We have some asks out presently, which is the first stage of that money raising, including some up in the State of Washington, obviously Boeing. We hope very much that they are going to be a major donor.

Virginia is coming through on the Dulles Center project with its promises in its Fiscal 1999 budget. It has infrastructure money, and the extra million dollars that it added at the request, really, of this committee some time ago, and we are quite confident that all of that is going to come through. So we will see how this proceeds because, obviously, it depends an awful lot on the success of the capital campaign for Dulles.

I spoke with you, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think with other members of the committee, about the possibility of our seeking to purchase with non-Federal funds a building in the area of American Art and the National Portrait Gallery. The obvious target has been the old Hecht Building, which is diagonally across the street from the Patent Office Building that contains those museums.

The purpose of it would be, first of all, to give swing space when we do the major remodeling, the repair and restoration, on the Patent Office Building itself. It would be very good to move everybody out and get that done more efficiently than otherwise would be true if we have to do it in sections with people still in the building.

Thereafter, we would look forward to that building being occupied by some of the uses that are presently in the Portrait Gallery and in the American Art Museum because we would very much like to increase the exhibition space in the Patent Office building, and that would mean moving some offices out and moving some other facilities out that are presently in there; like conservation, like archives, like photography, and putting them elsewhere.

In addition to that, we would see that building being used for trust-funded leases, especially, that are elsewhere in the city, so that we could be occupying it ourselves and get out of other lease space.

I have no idea whether we are going to be successful in arranging the financing in order to do this. If it looks as if we are, I will be coming to you, Mr. Regula, and to staff with a written proposal

that explains this in great length and, certainly, we would look forward to discussing this with you and getting your views as to whether or not you think it is permissible for us to go forward. But I am not at that stage yet in terms of knowing whether I am going to be able to find the financing.

From time to time, you have all asked about the balance between repair and restoration of our existing facilities and building new facilities. I have never been able, and I shall not be able now, to answer that in a definitive way.

I can only say that, given the fiscal preoccupations, understandably, of the Congress, the potential of getting money from the Federal Government to do new buildings has been minimized, which means that if we are going to do new buildings, or at least increase our space in the foreseeable future, we are going to have to be finding sources of funding outside of the Federal Government.

That will raise, of course, the problem of adding to the operating budget and what the sources of that additional funding are going to be. But it is going to be self-regulating in itself. The potential of raising that kind of money outside will dampen our attempts to go forward to increase space.

But I must say that an institution like the Smithsonian, which is in the collection business and exhibition business, simply cannot stop collecting. We can minimize it; we can limit it; we can be more and more careful about what we get; we can try to de-accession some of the things that no longer seem to be of great interest, but in the end, the numbers of things we have will increase if we are doing our job.

Some expansion is clearly in the cards, but it is going to be very moderate, I think, given the fiscal circumstances that I have indicated to you.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you all for your attention. I look forward for the three of us, if not the four of us, to cope with whatever questions you might like to ask.

[The information follows:]

# Testimony of I. Michael Heyman, Secretary
# Smithsonian Institution
# before the
# House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior
# And Related Agencies
# March 17, 1998

**Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee. I very much appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution, and to present a summary of our activities and our FY 1999 budget request. I know our many dedicated employees and volunteers join me in expressing our appreciation for your continued support, interest and guidance. Let me highlight some of the year's achievements.**

**We were delighted that the Smithsonian Institution attracted 30 million visits last year, an increase of more than 23% over the previous year. We greeted many of them with the Janet Annenberg Hooker Hall of Geology, Gems and Minerals at the National Museum of Natural History. The renovated 20,000 square foot gem hall is the most comprehensive Earth sciences complex of its kind, and displays some of the world's most dazzling gems and minerals. The Hope Diamond stands as its centerpiece.**

**In celebration of our 150th anniversary, "America's Smithsonian" was viewed by more than three million people in nine cities. Its treasures have returned to the Mall for exhibition in the Ripley International Center through mid-April, the timing to coincide with peak Spring visitation to the National Mall.**

**In 1997, our "Web audience" also visited the Smithsonian via our Home Page, which logged over 12 million "hits" a month, 20% of international origin. In addition to museum items, two Smithsonian Traveling Exhibition Service (SITES) exhibits also became available on the Web: "Ocean Planet," featuring ocean life and its conservation, and "Rotten Truth (About Garbage)," a fun and fact-filled look at trash -- how we make it, use it, and try to dispose of it. Although currently offering more than 40 hours of continuous material, expansion of our Home Page on-line service, and the digitization of our holdings, remain top priorities in our efforts to increase public access to the Institution's collections and expertise.**

**I am pleased to report that SITES exhibits consisting of forty exhibitions traveled in 1997 to 124 locations in 40 states. In addition, the Smithsonian, in partnership with the non-profit, educational program ARTRAIN, exhibited artwork on loan from the collections of the Smithsonian Associates Program at 37 stops in 14 states. More people throughout our nation than ever before are benefitting from our outreach efforts.**

Mr. Chairman, when I assumed the position of Secretary in September of 1994, I spoke of the Institution's need to develop widespread electronic access to our collections. I focused on the technical capacity to record our collections in digital form and transmit them on-line and via disk throughout the Nation and world, particularly to students. I am pleased to report great progress in this area. We have continued to improve our data communication network and information systems, making the resources of the Institution's libraries, archives, museums and research institutes more accessible.

The implications of these changes are staggering. They will allow us to link actual images to written information about objects. Upon the completion of this project, anyone with access to the Internet will be able, no matter where on our planet they may be, to find myriad Smithsonian objects electronically. Not only does this serve our guiding principles in ways unimaginable until the recent past, but it also benefits in limitless ways untold millions of people in every society on earth. Digitization of our collections will provide global availability to the riches of the Smithsonian, and we are pleased to have received $1.4 million in corporate support. For FY 1999, we are requesting an increase of $3 million for this ongoing and vital work.

Building on our 1996 banner year, when we celebrated our 150th year of service and aimed the Smithsonian towards the goals set by the Commission on the Future of the Institution, we continue reasonable steps to make deeper informational and educational inroads into communities across America. For example, the direct electronic hookup through the Museum of Natural History's Natural Partners Initiative with cultural resources and schools in Stark County, Ohio, will soon expand to the entire state. This program will enable Ohio students to visit the Museum on electronic field trips and it will facilitate direct conversations with the Museum's scientific and educational staff. This innovative program also currently links the Museum with schools in New York, Ohio, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Indiana, Arkansas, New Mexico, California, Texas, and Alaska.

Joining our museums and galleries, Smithsonian research institutes -- including the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) in Panama, the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC) in Edgewater, Maryland, and the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) in Cambridge, Massachusetts -- are now providing extensive on-line educational opportunities.

- "A Teaching Guide for Expedition Panama" was widely distributed by STRI to classrooms to encourage students to send questions to scientists via electronic mail. The program offers segments geared to complement textbooks and class discussions.
- SERC ushered in a new era of learning for school groups with the opening of its new Philip D. Reed Education Center. Although focusing primarily on students through the sixth grade, the facility promotes public participation in science education programs and accommodates older students, teachers and groups such as Scouts, summer educational camp participants and families. Two-thirds of the education

**center's funding comes from the private sector.**

- **At SAO, the MicroObservatory is a network of five automated telescopes that can be controlled over the Internet. They were designed to enable students and teachers nationwide to investigate the wonders of the deep sky from their classrooms. The telescopes were developed by SAO, with sponsorship by the National Science Foundation, Eastman Kodak and Apple Computer. A nationwide team of educators is developing the program with emphasis on collaborative projects in which observers share information, images and data.**

**The scientific research being conducted in these facilities is equally relevant, timely and global in scope. A few examples:**

- **At STRI, scientists are studying the dynamics of "El Nino," and gauging its impact on global environmental balance. Barro Colorado Island, home of STRI's primary research facility, has experienced the lowest rainfall in 73 years of record keeping. Remarkable long-term records are being compiled against which El Nino is being evaluated, and this information is being fed into the world's scientific community for further analysis and prediction of this damaging phenomena.**

- **From the SAO Observatory at Mount Hopkins in Arizona, we received news of scientists' discovery of a giant "Jupiter-like" body orbiting a star in the constellation Northern Crown. That has led to the heightened belief that giant planets are commonly in orbit about stars throughout the universe. Based on its standing as a leader in X-ray astronomy, and with the launch into space of the Advanced X-Ray orbiting observatory, scheduled for August of this year, SAO will join the Hubble Space Telescope and the Compton Gamma-Ray Observatory as part of NASA's fleet of "great observatories" which will continue to unravel the mysteries of time and space.**

- **SERC's research and associated education programs focus on investigating basic ecological processes and improving our ability to preserve and manage crucial natural resources. Using the geographic features of the Chesapeake Bay region, SERC conducts an intensive analyses of interconnected ecosystems. Working in conjunction with other Federal and State agencies, SERC scientists lead investigations of the introduction of non-indigenous species through the release of ballast water of foreign vessels into the Chesapeake Bay, a situation posing economical and ecological threats such as the invasion of zebra mussels in the Great Lakes. More recently, the SERC was enlisted to assist in identifying the source and possible solutions to the outbreak of the *pfiesteria piscicida* microbe found among fish in tributaries of the Chesapeake. The removal of both invasive species and pfiesteria in the Bay waters is critical to the health of the sea life and economy of the Bay region. These research efforts, as well as SERC's long-term study on the effects of agricultural nutrients run-off in the Bay region, will be of valuable assistance in**

the efforts to reduce pollution in our nation's waterways.

As this brief description of several of the year's events and achievements reveals, the Smithsonian is a place of unparalleled diversity. We are unique -- both within the public and the scientific communities. Therefore, we face significant and somewhat singular challenges, particularly as we proceed in new directions -- such as affiliations, corporate partnerships, and revenue ventures. In some respects, we have no role models. Faced with clearly defined priorities and acknowledging budgetary realities, we are making earnest efforts to chart a thoughtful course into very new and unique relationships. We have learned much, and have been encouraged by our experience with our 150th celebration, one in which our corporate partners helped us present the wonders of the Smithsonian to people across America.

Through philanthropic support, marketing sponsorships and business co-ventures, we hope to advance the Smithsonian's programs, outreach and financial goals. We have made significant progress towards developing a capital campaign to support many Smithsonian initiatives and are refining the Institution's guiding principles for corporate associations.

Plans developed for the upcoming national, Institution-wide capital campaign have set certain benchmarks for FY 1998, including: crafting a campaign strategy reflecting Institution-wide needs and gift opportunities; developing coordinated fund-raising policies; establishing marketing and public relations strategies; recruiting national campaign volunteer leadership; and expanding our prospective donor base.

One particularly generous 1997 donation is worthy of special recognition. The Smithsonian received $20 million from California businessman and philanthropist Kenneth Behring. As a result, NMNH can now move forward with renovation of the Rotunda and hall of mammals, and with the creation of a permanent traveling exhibition program.

We are pleased with our initial steps in developing additional revenue options to sustain and enhance our financial security. We are equally proud of the Institution's strides in bringing more of its wonders and discoveries to the world -- both physically and electronically. By lending some 200,000 objects and specimens to over 1,300 domestic, and 700 foreign institutions, the Smithsonian has raised the standards of specific exhibitions and research projects.

Recognizing our limitations of space and personnel within the Smithsonian, and with the ultimate goal of enriching the museum community at large, the Board of Regents in 1996, adopted a collections-based Affiliations policy. During the past year, we have signed memoranda of understanding with seven organizations, with two additional affiliations on the immediate horizon. The initial partnerships include Bisbee, Arizona Mining and Historical Museum; Miami Museum of Science and Space Transit; Museum of Progress in

**Scottsdale, Arizona; Central Alameda of San Antonio; National Museum of Industrial History in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; Origins of the Southwest Museum in Arlington, Texas; the Public Corporation for the Arts in Long Beach, California; and the Chabot Observatory in Oakland, California.**

**Now to summarize the Smithsonian Institution's budget: our request for all operating and capital accounts totals $419.8 million, an increase of $17.5 million over the FY 1998 appropriation. Of this amount, $357.3 million is for Salaries and Expenses. Of the total requested increase of $23.9 million in this account, approximately 43 percent is attributable to mandatory costs for sustaining base operations and the remainder is for priority program requirements for critical ongoing projects within the Institution.**

**We have categorized program requirements, totaling $16 million and 101 positions, in two areas: (1) the Digitization initiative mentioned earlier ($3 million) and (2) new facilities support at two museums, NMNH and the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) which totals $13 million.**

**NMAI is preparing for the movement of collections in New York to our new Cultural Resources Center in Suitland, Maryland. This request includes $11 million and 89 positions to support the physical move of artifacts; the beginning of operations; support services and security.**

**The request for NMNH includes $1.5 million for the East Court move and relocation of staff and collections. The request for the West Court includes 12 positions and $500,000 for facilities maintenance and security.**

**For Repair and Restoration our FY 1999 request is $40 million for an incremental increase to funding improvements in four of the Institution's oldest buildings, as well as allowing us to continue replacement of aging systems in other facilities. The Administration recognizes the need to apply additional resources for the repair and restoration of buildings, and has plans to reach the $50 million level recommended by the Commission on the Future of the Smithsonian during the 5-year budget planning period.**

**The request for the Institution's capital accounts includes $4.5 million for the National Zoological Park's construction and improvements account. We are re-projecting the Zoo's requirements based on criteria used by the Commission. A total of $2.0 million is also requested to continue the program of Minor Construction, Alterations and Modifications of facilities.**

**Like many organizations, and many families, the Smithsonian must address multiple obligations and competing priorities. Maintenance, repair and restoration of the historic public buildings that it occupies is of high priority among these, as is the fulfillment of obligations it has undertaken with the express authority of the Congress to preserve and**

interpret the national collections. The third structure for the NMAI, the Museum building on the Mall, represents completion of the facilities program outlined in PL 101-185. It is designed to house and display the comprehensive and irreplaceable collections of that museum. The legislation requires that no less than one-third of the estimated $110 million cost of the project be raised in the private sector, and that money has been raised. With these non-Federal funds and the $29 million appropriated for construction in FY 1998, the Institution can begin construction of the Mall Museum. The remainder of the matching federal funding will be required in FY 1999 ($16 million) and FY 2000 ($19 million) to complete the building.

The Congress has also authorized the construction of a new facility at Dulles Airport to preserve and interpret the national collections of the National Air and Space Museum. This facility is being designed in large part by the $8 million appropriated by Congress, and will be constructed entirely with funds to be raised from other sources.

To address space problems in another venue, consideration is being given to the acquisition by long-term lease or purchase of a building near the Patent Office Building which houses two museums and the Archives of American Art. Such an acquisition would provide swing space during the extensive renovation of the Patent Office Building, would facilitate expansion of exhibition space within that building, and would permit the efficient concentration of leased space presently located elsewhere. Such an arrangement would be done without increases to the federal budget of the Institution.

The Institution does not presently contemplate any new museums. If any are planned in the future, it is likely that private sources will contribute the necessary funds. There will, however, continue to be a need for additional space in which to store collections properly, even though the scale will be lessened by arrangements under our newly-adopted affiliation program.

As we resolve this need, the Smithsonian will be mindful of opportunities to better serve the visiting public, such as increasing the amount of public space in our landmark buildings, and we will address such opportunities with the Committee. The Smithsonian will carefully balance the need for construction to care for our collections with our commitment to serve as a good steward for the facilities entrusted to our care.

In a broad sense, this explains the complexity of our challenge; to balance our obvious need to maintain existing facilities, and to recognize that the Smithsonian is, and must be, a dynamic Institution, one constantly changing to reflect advancements in our society. We must continually assure that our collections and exhibits do accurately reflect not only our nation's past, but its present. Again, our affiliations policy reflects our efforts to find innovative ways of addressing this difficult challenge. With our affiliations arrangements, regional outreach and support of local museums can be accomplished without cost to the Institution for the maintenance and transport of the objects or the operation of these

**additional museums. The adoption of this policy, we believe, reflects our commitment to reduce storage facility needs while enriching local museums in communities throughout America.**

**We are looking forward to entering the new millennium with a renewed commitment to the American people to celebrate, preserve and honor the achievements of our society.**

**Thank you again, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, for this opportunity to review our efforts at the Smithsonian. I will be pleased to respond to any questions you may have.**

PERCENTAGE OF COLLECTIONS OF EXHIBIT

Mr. REGULA. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I have a few, and then we will go to the other members.

What percentage of your collections is actually on exhibit?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, first, I want to say that in the Museum of Natural History that contains a huge number of our objects—120 million out of the Institution's 140 million—there are lots of items that will never be exhibited, and there are lots of items that are very tiny. So you might get beetle collections or other kinds of insect collections with hundreds of thousands of items that are there for research purposes and I would say for archival purposes.

The Museum of Natural History is one of the world's greatest archives of materials that were once alive, which are just very valuable for a whole variety of reasons, especially as new techniques come, for analyzing those objects.

In any event, that is 120 million. Of that 120 million, we probably show 100,000 or maybe even less.

Then in the balance of the museums we have many fewer items, and we show a larger proportion of them. If you consider all of the items we have, we exhibit about 3 percent. I have not yet calculated what it would be if you took away those research collections. We still are not exhibiting a high proportion of what we have there in collections.

Mr. REGULA. In the minutes of your board meeting you have a whole list of new construction item proposals. I wonder if you analyze what you have and determine if there is some way to consolidate some of this. As you point out, even if you get private funding for a new building, the operation costs over a period of time will be greater than the cost of the building. I think there will be, in the foreseeable future, budget limitations.

It would seem to me that you have to consolidate some of what you have that probably is not relevant now, nor will it ever be.

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, I think we have to do somewhat more of that, and we are de-accessioning. I hope we are going to be able to find homes for a number of the items through the Affiliation Program. As that grows, more of our materials will no longer be in our own hands—physically, in our own collections—but I do not know how major that is going to be in terms of the numbers.

STRATEGY FOR FULFILLING FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS

I think that the pressure will come when we simply cannot hold any more, and that has a way of self-regulating itself in terms of those who are in charge of collections. But I did really want to say something about that paper that was in the Regents' agenda the last time, which is called, "Strategy for Fulfilling Facilities Requirements."

The reason that that paper was in there is because the regents have gotten very interested in space planning, and the Regents are as inquisitive of what we are proposing to do, as this committee is, with respect to going forward, especially if the proposal is that we go forward with money that is not Federal money.

So the desire for oversight is considerable, which I respect and I think is very proper. We are going to come before the Regents in

the next meeting or the one following with a space plan, but we thought we would give them the kinds of analysis that had been rattling around the Institution for some time to prepare them for when we come in with the space plan, and that was the "Strategy for Fulfilling Facilities Requirements," the paper that was in the Regents' agenda.

I took that, actually, this morning at home, and with my trusty calculator I took a look at what the 4.6 million additional square feet are all about. I found out that 1.252 million of that 4.6 million square feet are already approved because those are the Natural History wings, the Dulles, and the NMAI.

Mr. REGULA. Right.

Mr. HEYMAN. So that leaves me the balance, which is about 3.2 million. Of that balance, 720,000 square feet are in buildings like the Hecht Building that I just discussed. They are in the Federal Office Building on Independence Avenue, 10–B, which we have coveted because we could see ourselves taking all our Federal lease spaces—for instance, in L'Enfant Plaza and the like—and putting them in one place, and also have an arrangement with regard to chillers for the Air and Space Museum, for the Arts and Industries Building and the Castle that would work exceedingly well. That is another 251,000.

A third is some plan—it is not an actuality at all, we have never discussed this with the Regents at all—to acquire a building in Southwest, which would be a replacement for the large building that we lease at 1111 North Capitol, where the Office of Exhibits Central, mail, and a whole variety of those kind of activities are located. I do not know whether we can swing that, but that would be put and take space; again, relieving a lease.

And then the last is a small item, which is the Nichols School, which is near the Anacostia Museum, which is surplus property of the District School System and would just be a great enhancement to the Anacostia Museum. Again, I have no idea whether we can, in fact, swing this, but we are trying hard to see whether we, on a lease or whatever, could relieve some of the crowding at Anacostia.

That leaves approximately 2.5 million square feet, which I call "dreams." They are somewhere between the next 15 and 30 years, and I think all one can say is that they are dreams, and they are not ones that are, in actuality, being planned.

So that is a report which, on the face of it, seems very grand. But I think when one looks at it with care, it is not nearly as grand as it otherwise would seem.

Mr. REGULA. How many square feet do you lease?

Ms. NEWMAN. We will get that for you. It is about $6 million worth.

Mr. REGULA. You can submit it for the record.

[The information follows:]

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LEASED SPACE

**The Smithsonian Institution leases approximately 450,000 square feet of space in buildings located throughout the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.**

BACKLOG MAINTENANCE AT THE ZOO

Mr. REGULA. Backlog maintenance. I know you have the $250 million backlog that you have alluded to in the past, which did not include the National Zoo. Now, it is my understanding that there is about $65 million in the combination of Front Royal and the Zoo, $26 million of which is critical. How are you planning to address all of this?

Mr. HEYMAN. I think I would ask Mr. Rice or, Connie, do you want to do that?

Ms. NEWMAN. Mr. Chairman, what has happened is that the Zoo has gone through the same process as the Institution, as a whole, analyzing the buildings and the systems in the buildings. So the amount that you have is a result of the total analysis, but priorities will be set.

Mr. REGULA. You mean the $65 million?

Ms. NEWMAN. $65 million, yes. The priorities will be set determining what requires the restoration right now because there is an iminent safety problem, what is active, and then what is less important.

It will come to you in the same way that we have come to you with the Institution as a whole. So that you should not expect a request for the total amount because the priorities are quite different. In some of the buildings, it is a desire, but it is not of major concern to the Institution.

We are going to submit a full report to you on the Zoo analysis, as we did on the Institution, when it is completed. When will that be? Dr. Robinson?

Dr. ROBINSON. Well, it is well on the way at the moment. The reason all of this transpired, of course, is we have a new head of our Office of Construction and Maintenance, and she set this in place two years ago, and it takes a long time to work this out.

Mr. REGULA. Would the $40 million you have requested for maintenance include some at the Zoo?

Ms. NEWMAN. No. The Zoo is a separate request.

Mr. REGULA. So that would be an additional item.

Mr. HEYMAN. We put in approximately $3.8 million in the Zoo Construction request for R&R, but that was true last year, too. In fact, the lion's share was for repair and restoration.

Mr. REGULA. The lion's?

Mr. HEYMAN. The lion's share, that is right. [Laughter.]

Mr. REGULA. I will stop at that one. [Laughter.]

We could have a menagerie here.

SMITHSONIAN MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

One question, and then we will go to Mr. Skaggs.

You have heard me talk a lot about management. Could you cite any examples where, by applying good management techniques, you have been able to either become more efficient or reduce costs?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, yes. We went through, in the first two years that I was Secretary, taking out a whole level of middle management. So we no longer have six assistant secretaries, as we did have when I came. We have centralized a number of those functions in a single office of the Provost with a smaller staff than ex-

isted for the totality of the assistant secretaries who were in that activity area, and we have done the same over on the Under Secretary side.

So what we have done is to go from a circumstance in which, at least at the top management, we had a big horizontal line of assistant secretaries, we have gone to the Secretary, the Provost, and the Under Secretary as the decision-makers in the Castle rather than eight people.

I think that, first of all, saved money just simply because of the reduction in numbers of positions, although the full savings of that is slow in terms of attrition. But I think what it really has done is that it has made decision-making, certainly in the Central Administration, a lot more efficient with the trade-offs occurring within offices rather than between multiple Assistant Secretaries, each with their own budget.

Mr. REGULA. Do you constantly review the things that you do to say is this function still appropriate in 1998? You have such a wide range of areas of research. You mentioned the telescopes. I do not know what your so-called customer base is for that information; likewise, what you do in Panama and probably things that I have no knowledge of.

Do you have some review process to say is this function still—maybe it is nice—but is this still appropriate, given the constraints on our budget, in 1998 and future?

Mr. HEYMAN. Let me turn to my two chief operating officers. Dennis, do you want to talk about that a little at the unit levels on your side?

Dr. O'CONNOR. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, we meet regularly with the directors, and part of their planning is an annualized plan that they will perform during the course of the year, and that provides a forum for questions that you have just raised; is it appropriate, are there things that we are doing that we should no longer do?

I guess my question to them is, are there things that you would like to do more than you are doing now and, if so, what are those and where are the trade-offs?

I think that we can see, programmatically, a movement in that direction; a movement, for example, that has occurred with the fusion of the management of the Environmental Research Center at the Chesapeake Bay with the Natural History Museum. That integration, I think, is going to provide a new programmatic thrust that did not exist before, and it will not lead to any increase in personnel.

So unit-by-unit we do reviews, both annually and then during the course of the year every month in conversations with the directors.

Ms. NEWMAN. On the administrative side we do the same thing through the budget process. One way you get at asking the hard questions is, "If you were to have a 10 percent reduction, how would you reduce? What would be your decision-making process for reducing the amount?"

The other way in which the question gets raised is, "What would you out-source?" Now, when we ask the question "What would you out-source?" you are also asking the question, "What is it that you

need to be doing, period?" and then, "What do you need to be doing within the Institution?"

I find that the most valuable discussions about what we need to continue to do internally come through the question of out-sourcing because it pulls people out to ask the very tough questions when they are attempting to defend what it is that they are doing and when the questions are being asked, "Why are you doing what you are doing and could it be done in a more cost-effective way externally or do we still need to be providing those services?"

The last couple of years there have been some very interesting and tough discussions along those lines.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Skaggs.

PEER REVIEW OF SMITHSONIAN RESEARCH

Mr. SKAGGS. Thank you. Good morning, again.

I had in mind, and I think it follows on the Chairman's last question to pose what, I guess, has become sort of an annual question of my own about coordination of research activities with your sister institutions, both governmental and university.

For instance, you mentioned the El Niño research in Panama. How have you structured what may be going on in that area to avoid duplication with what NOAA may be working on or NSF through its grantees?

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman Skaggs, actually, it is interesting that much of the information on the intensity of El Niño has come from a cooperative work with NOAA and the satellites that are providing these very rich color-coded images on temperature of the surface water and below.

Our scientists are using that to correlate with this rather substantial decrease in rainfall, and then scientists at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute have begun to do very precise measurements of budding and flowering—increased budding and flowering—as a result of the decreased water.

All of that then is coupled together with yet another group of scientists, who are studying carbon dioxide fixation as a result of that process.

So we try to cooperate with a number of agencies. Currently, for example, there are 32 visiting scientists from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and I am missing one other department, who are resident at the Natural History Museum cooperating with our scientists.

Mr. SKAGGS. The Smithsonian's research activities are done, essentially, in-house, as I understand it. You are not making grants to others.

Dr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. SKAGGS. Which then raises the question that, let's say, compared to NSF, in which its grants or applications for grants are, I believe, generally, put through a pretty rigorous peer review process, what is the analog to that peer review stage of things to sort of check on the pursuits of scientists in your institutions?

Dr. O'CONNOR. First of all, for example, at the Astrophysics Lab, all of their research is almost 100 percent externally funded. So they go through the same kind of peer review process.

At Natural History, on the other hand, most of the peer review process that occurs there is not so much at the point in which funding is obtained, but rather after the funding is obtained, through the internal process. The peer review comes from publications and the review of the scientific data, as it is put out into the scientific literature.

I might also add that the scientists from Natural History, STRI, SAO, the Environmental Research Center, all serve as reviewers for the National Science Foundation, and so they are tied into that network and really know what is going on.

Mr. SKAGGS. One of the schools at home proudly published the cumulative number of footnotes which had cited research done by folks at the school as sort of the key leading economic indicator of the value of their past research. Do you all have a footnote barometer for the Smithsonian or is that a valid measure?

Dr. O'CONNOR. That is a cottage industry in the scientific literature, sir. I might add that it has been noticed that sometimes those who are most often cited are being cited because the work was not very good. So it comes and goes.

Mr. SKAGGS. There are good footnotes and bad footnotes.

Dr. O'CONNOR. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SKAGGS. Not a value-neutral commodity.

POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

You all sort of live at the exciting intersection of, on the one hand, the intellectual and cultural life of the country and, on the other hand, here you are at the political side of things. So I am just wondering how political correctness is doing at the Smithsonian these days.

You have had some exciting experiences in the last few years on that. I think, not wanting to make light of it, it is important for you all to continue to push the American public to understand itself as well as possible and not be trapped by too much of the political climate in doing so.

Mr. HEYMAN. That has been a preoccupation of mine for the three past years.

I have come to the view, Mr. Skaggs—this is especially relevant when we are in areas of political controversy—that we ought not shy away from the subject matter, but that what we ought to do, both in the morality of curatorship and also because it is politically wise, is to try to be as balanced as we possibly can, so that we are showing the contrary arguments and not just a single way of interpreting whatever the facts are.

I think that that is beginning to seep into the kind of Code of Conduct in the Smithsonian. I think that it will be very interesting to see, when we have the opening of the show on sweatshops in May, the extent to which that has migrated.

But I honestly believe, as I did when I taught for all of the years that I did, that when I was dealing with value collisions in teaching law or city planning, that I had an obligation to raise all of the arguments and not solely to present my own view. I think that is even more important in the context of museums because, at least in the context of the university, you have got active and lively students who pepper you with questions and counter-arguments, un-

less you are an absolute authoritarian in class, which is hard to do any more.

In museums, you really do not have the opportunity for that kind of interaction. If your audience is going to see more than one side, you have got to do it yourself, and it is not going to come because people are asking questions or making counter-statements.

So we talk about this a lot. I have been writing about it, and making speeches, and there are conversations that have been going on within the Institution. Clearly, not all agree with my view, but I think there are more now who do than previously was true.

Mr. SKAGGS. Although, your reference to university life raises an interesting possibility that you could have curator office hours of sorts, where if the interested public did want to come in and engage with those that put things together in whatever way they are put together, they could have an opportunity to have those kinds of conversations, too, and not be so passive.

Mr. HEYMAN. Actually, we do. We really try to give the opportunities often, with panels, with seminars, with programs in which people can interact. The problem really is that, if 10,000 people see your show, 100 show up for such a panel, so that you are not reaching most of the people who go through your exhibition.

Mr. SKAGGS. I was sort of thinking of a little sort of like Peanuts-type booth saying "the curator is in" over at the side of the exhibit.

Mr. HEYMAN. It sounds like a confessional. [Laughter.]

Mr. SKAGGS. One budget question; the forward funding request for the American Indian Museum, have we done that before, Mr. Chairman? Are we able to do that?

Mr. REGULA. We are taking a look at that. It is unique.

Mr. SKAGGS. I know on my other subcommittee, it is one of the most provocative things that can happen, to ask for forward funding on construction.

Mr. HEYMAN. We were a little surprised when our request for the total came back in two parts, and I had not known that there was such a technique. But I now have the OMB guidance on the use of that technique. I have been informed, in any event, that this has been used in Defense appropriations, but I do not know if it has been used otherwise.

But, obviously, what it does do is that it puts off to the next fiscal year the scoring of that amount of money. From our point of view, what it does is really permit us to get going this year. It is very tough to start construction until you have all of the money, and we are okay on the private side now because we have raised all of that money or have pledges, and we can put risk capital in front of the pledges. But it is pretty hard to start until you get the whole of the Federal appropriation.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Nethercutt.

### PRIVATE FUNDING FOR MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, ladies and gentlemen.

With regard to the National Museum of the American Indian, how much have you raised in private funds or have pledged?

Mr. HEYMAN. We are really in the 40s or the low 50s in total. But for the construction of the mall museum, we have raised $36.6

million, which is a third. The original authorizing legislation proposed that the Federal Government would be no more than two-thirds. So we have always taken that as a one-third/two-third match, and we have raised our one-third.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Are you telling us that you have, in your private fund-raising undertakings, raised between $40-and $50 million?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Is there any reason why, notwithstanding the act that authorized the not more than two-thirds approach, that private money cannot support a greater proportion than one-third?

Mr. HEYMAN. No, except that most of that was raised for specific purposes. Part of it was raised for endowment; part of it was raised for outreach; part of it was raised for activities that go on at the Haye Center in New York. In other words, most of it has come in semi-restricted because there is a campaign plan and people have given to the particular objects or objectives, rather, in that plan.

So it is not so easy to move that money around, given that the people who contributed it contributed for specific purposes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I am just thinking in terms of the budget restrictions we have, trying to stay within our caps, if it is not advisable to make that offer.

Mr. HEYMAN. I understand that, sir. We did make that offer, and it was taken, with regard to the Suitland facility. That really strained our capacity to move money around because, as I understand it, in any event, what occurred was that the amounts that were unrestricted were largely used for supplementing what we thought was going to be entirely Federal funding for that building.

## ARCHITECTURAL CONTRACT FOR THE MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Is there any controversy relative to the construction design or architectural design of the building or the location of the building or any of those things on the Mall at this point? Have you heard any criticism or concern?

Mr. HEYMAN. No. Everybody has been quite happy with the conceptual drawings, what it is going to look like and its location. We are having a little difficulty right now in our relationships with the team of architects in terms of finishing the production of the construction drawings. But my able Under Secretary is taking care of that beautifully.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. What is the nature of the controversy?

Mr. HEYMAN. I will let her explain it to you.

Ms. NEWMAN. The contract was let in 1994——

Mr. NETHERCUTT. The architectural contract?

Ms. NEWMAN. The architectural contract was let in 1994 for work to be completed in June of 1998. The firm was Geddes, Brecher, Qualls & Cunningham—GBQC—with the lead architect, Doug Cardinal, who is Native American, and that is important for this particular contract for me to say that to you.

The design was due in June of 1997, 35 percent design was due in June. We did not receive that design and, in fact, received only 20 percent design in August.

Then the construction documents were due in December of 1997. That meant 65 percent. We did not receive that. So we sent a cure notice to them in December and gave them until the 12th of January to respond. Their response was unsatisfactory because there was a split between the GBQC and the lead architect. We, therefore, then sent a default termination to them in January.

At the same time, I want you to know that there is a parallel operation going on, which is an analysis of what it is we, in fact, have; what is the cost of what has been presented to us and what do we need to do to ensure that this design can come in at $110 million, close to the date that we expected it.

But the contractor has rights. So we have the default termination, and they have a right of appeal to the Secretary.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. They, the architects?

Ms. NEWMAN. The architectural engineers have a right of appeal. They had until the 11th of March. They, in fact, submitted an appeal on March 3rd. But they have additional documents that they have 45 days to submit. So by the 27th of March they will submit those to the Secretary, and the Secretary then will make a final determination. If he does not determine in their favor, they can then go to the U.S. Federal Claims Court.

So we are having the conflict, but we need to assure you that we are not stopping work. We have people analyzing and determining what it will take for us to carry this out internally with some outside consultants if the architectural engineers do not prevail in their appeal.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. What is the nature of their appeal, just in general?

Ms. NEWMAN. They are saying that, in fact, they can now—they are talking about the future—they will get back together and that they can now present the design, the construction documents, as required, on schedule and within our costs. I should stop there. I do not want to get us into trouble.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I understand. I do not want to get you in trouble either. I am just trying to understand if there is any reasonable justification or whether we are wasting—it appears they may be some slippage here on time, and I am wondering how that might affect—I heard you say you might be able to stay on schedule notwithstanding this appeal process and so on. You feel that way?

Ms. NEWMAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I do not know if I have any more time left.

Mr. REGULA. Yes, you have some additional time. We have been informal this morning.

## NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I want to turn to the National Zoo for a minute. We have had a previous hearing here where we talked about the fire protection and suppression systems at the National Zoo.

The Subcommittee was informed at the time that you were relatively satisfied with the system currently in place at the Zoo, and I heard you testify, Mr. Chairman, about the $3.8 million to do repair and improvements at the Zoo, which includes upgrading the fire protection system.

Has there been some change of heart relative to the fire protection system that suddenly it may not be adequate now or to what extent is there an adjustment in your prior thinking?

Ms. NEWMAN. At the time, Mr. Congressman, that we made that observation, we were very much concerned about the imminent danger because of the problem with the fire safety system, and we have taken care of that.

What we are now talking about is long-term upgrading of the system. But the money that was used at the outset, did take care of the problem that we had raised with you.

Mr. HEYMAN. Mr. Nethercutt, we have an appropriation for FY 1998 of $770,000 for that, and we are seeking $120,000 this year. So it is not——

Mr. NETHERCUTT. So it is a small——

Mr. HEYMAN. It is a small amount in relationship to a problem which we were able, at least it appears here, to address last year.

Ms. NEWMAN. At a million dollars.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. What is the million dollars?

Ms. NEWMAN. Well, it was the entire safety system that required that much upgrading, which we have taken care of by an internal reprogramming from the central repair and restoration account.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. So you spent a million?

Ms. NEWMAN. It was close to a million.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes. In addition funds are available for fire detection and suppression, plus access safety and security, that combination, from Zoo R&R. Of that, $770,000 went into fire detection and suppression.

Ms. NEWMAN. And we did come here for the reprogramming. We did notify you of that.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I understand. And you want to do another $120,000; is that right?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Last December, I am informed, there was some wide attention given to a female researcher at the Yerkes Primate Research Center in Atlanta who died after coming in contact with a macaque monkey infected with the Herpes B virus. She got some fluid in her eye, apparently.

You have the same kind of monkey at the National Zoo, and I am wondering if there is any danger to the public or others?

Dr. ROBINSON. There is no danger to the public. All of the animals are behind glass, so that won't affect the public, and we have strict processes for contact with the animals. As far as I know, there are none of our monkeys that are Herpes virus carriers where staff are not aware of that and would not get involved in that kind of contact.

[The information follows:]

*Creating the Nation's first BioPark*
National Zoological Park · Smithsonian Institution · Washington, D.C. 20008-2598

April 13, 1998

Honorable Ralph Regula
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Regula:

I was both right and wrong about the macaques. The species at Atlanta are not a risk here. But we have one Celebes macaque and one Lion-tail macaque that test positive for virus B antibody. This means that they have been exposed to the virus at some stage in their life. It says nothing about infectiousness or sickness. For safety's sake we treat them as potentially infectious. They are either off exhibit or on Monkey Island where they are either behind glass or a 35 foot moat. I was right that the keeper staff have been very strictly instructed about the danger of Herpes B as stated in my answers.

Sincerely,

Michael H. Robinson
Director, NZP



This paper contains recycled fiber and is recyclable

Mr. NETHERCUTT. So you are aware of it, and you are taking some precautions with your zookeepers.

Dr. ROBINSON. Yes, we have learned that from the Yerkes Center. We have new regulations in place. We can provide you with details of that.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. No, I just was concerned about it. I did not know if there were other people at risk, perhaps those folks that handle the animals there. I wanted to be sure you were aware.

Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Skaggs, do you have any additional questions?

Mr. SKAGGS. No, sir.

SECURITY AT MUSEUMS AND COLLECTIONS STORAGE SITES

Mr. REGULA. A couple of things. What is the current condition of security at the museums and collection storage sites? Security takes on a lot of dimensions.

Ms. NEWMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have two ways of assuring security; one is through our automated systems and the other through actual personnel.

When we have concerns about the automated system, it means that we are required to increase or move around a higher percentage of the personnel.

In the analysis of our needs, however, we do believe that to bring our systems up to quality required, we need close to $12 million.

One way that we are addressing that need is through the repair and restoration that is going on now. For example, as we go into Natural History, American History, when we go into American Art and the Portrait Gallery, we will, at the same time, build in the requirements for the network to support that system.

The $12 million assumes, to a certain extent, that we are not going about it in that way. However, we had hoped at one time that the money that was available—the terrorism money that would be available to Federal agencies—would be available to us in order to upgrade our entire system. We are concerned that we do not have card access. We would like to upgrade our alarm monitoring. We want more closed circuit TV.

But the truth of the matter is we are comfortable that our collections are safe, that the public and the staff are safe because we have altered the personnel balance in order to ensure that.

Mr. REGULA. So you would classify it as adequate, at least.

Ms. NEWMAN. It is for now, but the preferred strategy is for us to upgrade that system and be able to reduce the level of personnel and to have a much more sophisticated process.

I want to say to you that we are not concerned about the safety. However, it is in the Institution's best interest over the near term to repair and to restore to the Institution a more sophisticated system.

STAR SPANGLED BANNER

Mr. REGULA. I note, Mr. Secretary, that the Pew Charitable Trust has indicated an interest, as part of the millennium celebration, providing $5 million if it were to be matched by $5 million Federal to restore the Star Spangled Banner. What is the status of that?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, I think that Pew has gone even a little further than that, at least in its own mind; that should the Congress respond to the request that has come for millennium funds and should we get $3 million of that, they would be willing to credit some of our regular budget that has been utilized in relationship to the Star Spangled Banner as part of that $5 million.

They have also indicated to us that they would help us seek to raise some additional money from other foundations. So they are being very cooperative, and I am really quite confident that the grant from Pew will come through.

Mr. REGULA. In this budget, do you have the money for the Smithsonian match or would that have to come in the——

Mr. HEYMAN. No, we have that—not the $3 million, but $2 million we would be able to work out from base budget, yes. We would not need an additional.

Mr. REGULA. But you would need the additional $3 million.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, we would need the additional $3 million. I mean, we would need the $3 million, and we can find enough credits in American History budget for the $2 million.

Mr. REGULA. So you would need that in your Fiscal Year 2000.

Ms. NEWMAN. No, 1999.

Mr. REGULA. You need it in 1999, the $3 million?

Mr. HEYMAN. I believe that in the President's budget there is a request for $50 million next year; $25 million to go to Federal agencies, and we would get some portion of that $25 million.

Mr. REGULA. So you would anticipate it would be part of that.

Mr. HEYMAN. If that comes through, and I keep my fingers crossed.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Yates.

Mr. YATES. Thank you. Hi, how are you?

Mr. HEYMAN. Hello, Mr. Yates.

AMERICA'S SMITHSONIAN

Mr. YATES. Hi, Mike.

Tell me how your 150th anniversary show went. Do I have the impression that you came out of that with a debt?

Mr. HEYMAN. We came out with a debt. We were talking about that before. We have come out with a debt, which we are reducing by a variety of means, by other kinds of arrangements with the sponsors; one is the NOVUS credit card. We are going to put whatever is earned on that towards that debt. We also have the possibility that is being explored by the Under Secretary for an international tour. It would not be the same artifacts, but that would be a tour, which would, if it occurs, be profitable, and we would apply the profit of that towards the debt.

Thereafter, we would simply absorb the remainder in trust funds and view "America's Smithsonian", as the Regents have, as an investment of the Institution for a whole bunch of purposes. The Capital Campaign that will be forthcoming, and the Affiliations Program that seems to be picking up steam around the country, and the portion which we cannot match, we will view as an investment to get us around the country.

But you know, Mr. Yates, that "America's Smithsonian" had over 3 million people visit it, and now it is in Washington in the Ripley

Center. So people in Washington, D.C. have the opportunity to see it, too.

Mr. YATES. How was the debt incurred? Were there not enough people to see the show?

Mr. HEYMAN. We did not charge admission, you will recall.

Mr. YATES. Oh, I see.

Mr. HEYMAN. We based this all on sponsorships, and we did not get as many sponsors as we had hoped.

Mr. YATES. I see. How long do you think it will take to pay it off?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, five years. That is what we have been thinking of—a five-year range.

Mr. YATES. That is pretty good. It is a big debt, is it not?

Mr. HEYMAN. It is in the 20s. I am not exactly sure where it is in the 20s now, but it is in the 20s.

CONDITION OF SMITHSONIAN BUILDINGS

Mr. YATES. How is the condition of your buildings?

Mr. HEYMAN. Do you want to talk about that a little bit, Under Secretary Newman?

Ms. NEWMAN. Yes. We have conducted a major analysis of our buildings; the status of the HVAC systems, the roofs, the facade, to determine where, given their age, where they are on a continuum, and we have established priorities based on the age of the building and the actual determination of the condition of the building.

We have determined that American Art and the Portrait Gallery and, later, the Arts and Industries Building and the Castle, are the three remaining buildings that require immediate—or fairly immediate, within the next two or three years—attention.

Mr. YATES. How much money will you need for those?

Ms. NEWMAN. We are saying that we really need for those buildings and for our buildings, generally, a level of $50 million a year in order to bring those up to the level that is required and to keep the other buildings at a level required; that we would need to maintain $50 million a year.

We are saying that we have——

Mr. YATES. How many years?

Ms. NEWMAN. We are saying forever because, you see, we restored Freer and Sackler, and that is in good condition. But, as time goes on, the systems that were put in there will require attention. So we are saying there is a cycle and, given the cycle, it requires a certain level of investment each year to keep all of the 300 buildings at a status that we require.

Mr. YATES. I hope the reporter caught the incredulity in my voice. [Laughter.]

I remember, some years ago, we put money in the budget to pay for restoring the glass roofs of the Smithsonian buildings. Do you remember that? Did you ever do that?

Ms. NEWMAN. Do you mean for the National Gallery?

Mr. YATES. Not for the National Gallery. I am talking about glass roofs——

Ms. NEWMAN. At the Freer. At the Freer, we did do that.

Mr. YATES. Are they in shape now?

Ms. NEWMAN. Yes.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, we are presently doing it at the Air and Space Museum. All of that glass is getting replaced.

Ms. NEWMAN. The windows.

SMITHSONIAN BUDGET NEEDS

Mr. YATES. Is your budget adequate for your purposes? [Laughter.]

Mr. HEYMAN. One could always use more, but, yes. If we can continue the tradition of getting our mandatories and our inflation adjustment so that we can keep up our base, we have the right kind of flexibility so that, in general, it is an adequate budget.

Mr. REGULA. Let me follow up simply to say if our allocation requires that there be less——

Mr. HEYMAN. Then we have troubles.

Mr. REGULA. But you will be able to prioritize for us.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir. If it turns out that way, I would appreciate what you have done in the past, which is to permit me to confer with you about that.

Mr. REGULA. Indeed, we will. Once we know what we are dealing with, we will get back to you.

Mr. HEYMAN. Thank you.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Nethercutt.

SMITHSONIAN RESEARCH BUDGET

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of more questions.

How much money is spent on Smithsonian research, how much in your budget would you estimate?

Mr. HEYMAN. We are looking it up. This is a very hard question. The reason that it is a hard question is that people who do research are also doing exhibitions, by and large, and it is very hard to allocate between the two.

For instance, putting aside scientific research at the moment, if you are in an art museum, and there are seven, most of the research that occurs is in the preparation of catalogues for shows, and whether to think about that in exhibit terms or research terms is just hard.

Also, we do research in Air and Space and in Natural History. In Natural History it is a little easier because there are some people who only do research and do not do exhibitions. But in most of the other places it is a mixed bag. We have been testing systems of having people try to put their time into different categories. We have only had one year of that experience. We are not very satisfied with it yet, but it will be the first attempt that we have made to discern between program exhibition, on the one hand, and research on the other.

I have said in the past that, by and large, it is about 50/50, and I think that will probably bear out.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. 50/50 of what?

Mr. HEYMAN. Of exhibition and research, when you look at that part of our—that is our output, basically; our exhibitions, other public programs, and research. That is what we do. I have thought about it in terms of something like, roughly, half and half.

But, as I say, it is very imprecise because it is very hard to allocate amongst many of the individuals. It is a little like universities in that sense.

WHY SMITHSONIAN DOES RESEARCH

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I have been a reader of the Smithsonian Magazine. I find it very interesting. I, in fact, read an article some time ago on methyl bromide for agricultural uses.

Following up on Mr. Skaggs' line of questioning and the Chairman's, I just was thinking we have the National Science Foundation; we have the Department of Agriculture; we have all of the universities that do, literally, billions of dollars' worth of research, around this country; we have NIH; we have tremendous resources, and I am wondering, No. 1, just for the record, how can you justify—I do not mean that in an offensive way—justify for the committee why the Smithsonian ought to be doing any scientific research, as opposed to feeding off of the other governmental resources and university resources, assuming that there is some substantial cost to it, and, second of all, is there a charge in the mission of the Smithsonian to do scientific research and present it?

Mr. HEYMAN. The Smithsonian, really, its strategic plan, if you will, built in from the very beginning was the Smithson bequest, which is the beginning of the whole Smithsonian, and he left this money for the increase and diffusion of knowledge, and it was taken from the very beginning that increase really meant research. As a matter of fact, the first Secretary of the Smithsonian, Joseph Henry, viewed the Smithsonian solely as a research institution and did not see it having other roles.

He saw it collecting some, but only in relationship to research, and the research product would be by scholarly papers and by like kinds of product.

The second Secretary of the Institution, Spencer Baird, was a naturalist, and he also was the assistant secretary or under secretary for Henry. He had a lot of objects, natural objects, and he believed that not only should we be doing research on those natural objects—many of them were the product of Western exploration—but he thought we also ought to exhibit them.

We have gone along from the very beginning balancing research with exhibition and other kinds of public programs.

What happens, of course, is that we get our niches. I would be happy—and it is hard to do here to take us through the whole of the Institution—but what you find, for instance, presently, is that our chief research institute that is also a museum, which is Natural History, has a niche.

It really is, as I was saying before, the archive of the United States, as far as natural objects are concerned, and I would say thank goodness for that because at the university level, as people have become more and more interested in molecular genetics and a variety of other experimental kinds of analyses, we have persisted in keeping this collection, which others are giving up. I can take you through universities around the United States that are going out of the business of keeping objects, systemizing in terms of those collections, and having them available for a whole variety of research that still is exceedingly useful.

I would say that if the Smithsonian gave that up and gave up the associated collection management and analysis of that material, we would leave a big hole in the future with respect to the natural sciences in the United States.

I can take you through other things that we do, which you can see historically how they came to pass, and what are the niches that they are covering. If you take the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, which is now one of the premiere astronomy units in the world, it fits right into what is happening with NASA and with NSF because much of its funding comes from them, and it is a principal agency now that is carrying out missions for them in terms of managing those missions and doing a lot of the basic research that occurs.

Part of that is historical accident, just like institutions always grow. If you look at what is happening at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, it is probably the premiere tropical biology institution in the world, and that happens because of its location. It was there. It had people in it who were aggressive, in terms of building it. It is not duplicative research.

In fact, people who are interested in that come from other places to it and become resident scholars and do their research there. But I think we could go through the whole of the science program in the Smithsonian and show that it is differentiated from others. It is related, but it has its own special niches, and it is darn good, and it would be a shame to give that up, at least from my perspective, as an undertaking.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I understand. I am not surprised that you would feel that way.

Mr. HEYMAN. Passionately. [Laughter.]

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I know.

Mr. YATES. That is the purpose of Smithsonian, actually, is to do research, and if research is not to be continued, I would hope it would be from another institution that the research was taken away because that has been the Smithsonian's job, that has been its function, and it has been outstanding in the field of research.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I learned a lot about methyl bromide. I am just wondering why the Smithsonian is doing methyl bromide research, that is all.

Could you, for the record——

Mr. HEYMAN. Mr. Nethercutt, I doubt if we are. About ten percent of the contents of Smithsonian Magazine have to do with what is happening at the Smithsonian. It is viewed at the Smithsonian as an independent activity. So that most of what it writes about is happening outside of the Smithsonian. I would be surprised if we were doing that research there.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Would you kindly, for the record, advise the committee of the answer to the question about how much is devoted to research at the Smithsonian.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, we shall.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Thank you very much.

[The information follows:]

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION RESEARCH

In FY 1997 the Institution spent approximately $85 million or 26 percent of the Salaries and Expenses account on research.

Mr. REGULA. Anyone else?

Mr. SKAGGS. As evidence that the Smithsonian's magazine subject matter extends way beyond the Smithsonian, they had a piece, which I am actually going to give you a note about, a piece a couple of years ago, last fall, about Congress and behavior of Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I would like to get the citation on that one. [Laughter.]

Mr. SKAGGS. If there is a curator down there working on Congress, we really ought to know about it. [Laughter.]

SMITHSONIAN PRIORITIES

Mr. REGULA. I want to close the hearing, but I think Mr. Nethercutt has a point, and that is, whether it is the materials in storage, whether it is research, I think you should constantly have a critical analysis to determine if this is relevant in 1998 and prospectively in the future because it is all expensive. I think, as far as the eye can see, you are going to be constantly faced with prioritization.

I would like to put $50 million in backlog maintenance, and I would like to deal with the problems at the Zoo. But to do that, it has to come from somewhere else. So it becomes a management function of saying are the 99 percent, give or take, of things that are in storage are they all relevant either today or at some time in the future, or should you be doing some de-accessing, I guess is the word, to avoid building new buildings. New buildings mean people, they mean heat, and light, and air conditioning, in many instances. They are expensive.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, on that point, there is a rumor that Renwick is going to be converted to a presidential museum. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEYMAN. There are lots of rumors.

Mr. YATES. That is not true.

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I must say that from time to time I have thought would it not be nice if we took all of the things in the Smithsonian that related to the presidency and had them next to the White House, but I think the obstacles to doing that are considerable.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, may I just interrupt?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I might say, too, out in Spokane, Washington, my hometown and the center of my district, there is an Indian museum that is proposed, and I suggest to you that the Cheney Coles Museum there would welcome, excess items, in the broadest sense without derogating from their value. This may be something to think about in terms of the other museums that are not Smithsonian, but are around the country who may welcome some of the things that you must leave in storage.

Mr. HEYMAN. We would be delighted. You know we have started this Affiliations Program, and we would be delighted of a showing of interest, and then we could start a conversation, and I am sure

something could come of it. So, please, if you could give them the word, we would be appreciative.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SMITHSONIAN HOME PAGE

Mr. REGULA. I think it is a great idea, and you have pursued that path.

In the 12,000 hits a month that you got on your Web site——

Dr. O'CONNOR. 12 million, sir.

Mr. REGULA. Wait a minute, 12 million a month?

Dr. O'CONNOR. It is 12 million, right.

Mr. REGULA. Is this all from people seeking information? What kind of hits do you get in that 12 million?

Dr. O'CONNOR. The hits tend to follow the behavior of people that would visit the Mall physically. About 20 percent are from overseas. The most significantly visited pages are Air and Space followed by Natural History followed by American History and the Zoo. The demographics are also interesting.

Mr. REGULA. That is fantastic. Does this develop an e-mail message from those people that are taking advantage of your Internet facilities saying, "We think you ought to have this on"? Constructive criticism, I guess, is——

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes. Yes, quite a bit.

Mr. REGULA. Do you get some of that?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, quite a bit.

Mr. REGULA. Other than from this committee? [Laughter.]

Mr. HEYMAN. A lot of it is invited. Comments are invited at a number of the sites.

Mr. REGULA. Is that right?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes.

Mr. REGULA. That is very interesting.

Well, there will be questions for the record, and we will be back to you on priorities.

VISITING STUDENTS

Mr. Moran, would you like to introduce your guests here?

Mr. MORAN. They are all from Mount Vernon High School, and they are all the best students in the Governments Class. They decided, even though the President is up here speaking, that they would learn more by coming to this Appropriations hearing under Chairman Regula and listening to the Smithsonian Institution. [Laughter.]

Mr. REGULA. Yes, they are the brightest students. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORAN. That is right. That puts us in line for a grant some day, if we can think of something——

[Laughter.]

Mr. MORAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for letting me introduce them.

SMITHSONIAN MEDIA PRODUCTIONS

I have three small areas to ask about.

Incidently, it is phenomenal to me how great a job Mrs. Newman can do with the Smithsonian and the Financial Control Board. This

woman must never sleep. I used to know her at HEW, when she worked for the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, and was taking care of migrant farm workers. She has a phenomenal record of public service.

But anyway, let me get back to the point. One thing I wanted to say, is that it is so exciting what the Smithsonian is doing with regard to making its collections available throughout the country. I know you must have talked about this, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Nethercutt, but, boy, leading the way, making this truly a national institution, I just can't thank you enough for that kind of initiative.

I read an interesting thing, that you are going to get into the movie-making business. The Washington Post reported yesterday that you signed an agreement to produce full-length, made-for-TV-movies, with Mandalay Television Pictures and Showtime Networks, and you are going to be drawing from your vast collections of artifacts and materials. You are going to do three films, and it is going to give credibility to these films, obviously.

I want to know, is this the kind of thing that you are going to be expanding? Do you keep creative control over these movies? Is this the start of something really big or is this just kind of putting your foot in the water to see how it works?

Mr. HEYMAN. That is a very good question. We have been dealing with a Hollywood agent, the Creative Artist Agency, seeing whether there was some fit between the Smithsonian and media of the sort that film, TV, and other kind of productions.

We have been talking about this and looking at opportunities now for the last year-and-a-half. This is the first one that is working.

Whether this is a harbinger of a lot that will work, I just do not know. I think that you put your finger on a very interesting fact, which is that we have to retain a considerable amount of responsibility for content, for all of the obvious reasons, and that is hard for producers and directors to live with when they are in the business of making money.

So whether we can really pull this off, I do not know. I think this will be a very interesting experiment to see whether this works well. I hope we will because, if we do, that means that is yet another way that the Smithsonian can get out with its materials and its stories.

Mr. MORAN. Yes. Good.

SMITHSONIAN HOME PAGE

The second area was getting the Smithsonian on line—getting all of this wonderful material on line. A lot of people are asking us, they see a little bit of it, and they are asking how much are you putting in to getting it all on line? You have got another $3 million for digitization in the budget. Are you going to make exhibits, virtual exhibits, on-line to people around the world that may not be able to come to Washington, but could experience it through the Internet?

Mr. HEYMAN. We are doing two things at the moment; one is we are putting exhibitions on line, and we have a number on line now, and we are even designing one that is specifically for the Web. It is not simply replicating an exhibition in a museum.

Secondly, we are trying to digitize as many two- and three-dimensional objects as we can in the Smithsonian and have them available for people to see, together with explanatory text. The monies that we are seeking, in terms of our base, are largely to enlarge that number of digital images and have them in a system in which you or I or anybody else who wishes can find them and find something about them that accompanies the image.

Mr. MORAN. Again, that is terrific, and it broadens the base of support for the Smithsonian.

One last area.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir.

NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Mr. MORAN. That is the National Zoo. There is a report out recently that shows that about four of the parts of the property there are in serious need of repair, and we have people throughout the Metropolitan Washington area that are concerned about this.

They put in money through FONZ, and I know you get some private contributions. I doubt the private contributions represent a lot in terms of percentages. Are the animal habitats compromised by the current conditions at the facility and is there enough money in this budget to upgrade those facilities that came out wanting in the last report that just came out? That is, the last area I am going to ask about, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. NEWMAN. I think we can say that we are comfortable that this request, in addition to a request that we will be making in the future based on an analysis of all of the facilities there, will be adequate for the Zoo.

We are not concerned about the health and safety of the people working there or the visitors, nor are we——

Mr. MORAN. I think, actually, these people are more concerned about the animals.

Ms. NEWMAN. Well, I was going with the animals. Nor are we concerned about the conditions for the animals. What we do know, though, is that, given the age of the facilities, that we are going to have to go through the same kind of analysis there as we have gone through for the rest of the Institution, and we are in the process of doing that.

I do not know if the director wants to add——

Dr. ROBINSON. Well, certainly, I do not think any animals are in substandard conditions at all anywhere in the Zoo.

Mr. MORAN. They all seem pretty happy, especially that gibbon. But you do not know, and, apparently, the report implied that some of the habitats may be compromised, but I doubt that you would let that happen.

Dr. ROBINSON. No. In the short-term, there are repairs needed, and this has been accumulating, as with the rest of the Smithsonian over the years, and we have been very assiduous in dealing with this. I think you will find—we should invite you to come and have a look at the Zoo and its new image and see if you feel that.

Mr. MORAN. That is terrific. This is probably the only group of witnesses that would use terms like assiduous or as impressive as assiduous. [Laughter.]

Mr. REGULA. They hope they are. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORAN. Thank you. You are doing a great job in every aspect. And all of the people that work with you I think are just really professional, first-class. So thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. REGULA. I want to thank all of you. We have had a good hearing, and we will be communicating with you once we know what our priorities are as a committee, so that we can achieve the best possible use of the funds available.

I hope that you will continue to evaluate all of your operations to make them as cost-effective as possible. I always remember in World War II when they issued stickers to everybody to put on the dashboard of your car that said, "Is this trip really necessary?" because of the enormous fuel shortage. I think you have to take the same approach in any institution; is this function really necessary? Is it serving a good, useful purpose?

Thank you. We are recessed until 1:30.

[The following questions and answers were submitted for the record:]

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Overall Budget- Program Increases

Question 1: The budget for the Smithsonian Institution in fiscal year 1999 provides for increases in every category. Should this funding level not be available, how would you re-prioritize your entire request?

Answer: Our highest priority is the Salaries and Expenses account and its associated increase. Of that increase, 79% is for mandatory personnel-related costs. The Smithsonian must have these funds to support the remarkable staff that is the means by which the Institution can accomplish its mission. The balance of 21% represents the increasing costs of operating the Institutional infrastructure: items such as utilities, communications, and the rental of space in which to carry out Smithsonian activities.

All of the program increases in the S&E account are related to FY 1999 performance goals of the Institution. The three related to the National Museum of the American Indian and the East and West courts of the National Museum of Natural History will put the facilities that have been under construction in a position to be occupied. The increase related to the digitization of collections is central to extending the reach of the Smithsonian to other areas of the country and around the world.

Increases sought for Construction and Improvements at the National Zoo and in the Repair and Restoration of Buildings account are related to systematic programs for assuring acceptable performance of facilities over building life cycles of 40 years. Bringing facilities to those levels and keeping them there will have positive effects on long-term maintenance costs, as well as on public accessibility to and use of those facilities.

The key component of increase in the Construction account is phased funding to complete construction of the Mall museum building of the National Museum of the American Indian. The Museum in its three parts has now been 11 years in the making. Availability of the new funding will ensure the completion of all of the parts of the museum required by the agreement and its opening to the public in 2002.

Question 2: The budget request for Salaries and Expenses includes $10.274 million for pay and uncontrollable expenses and $14.382 million for specific program increases. If the allocation does not allow for your full request, how would you prioritize your program increases?

Answer: Digitization of the collections is the highest priority, as it will greatly enhance the ability to view and study the National collections across the country.

Of equal importance to the Institution is providing support services such as building maintenance to the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History. Construction of the East Court will be completed in May 1998. The tenants will need support by late summer. A major tenant of East Court is the Department of Entomology. That department has begun to pack specimens and prepare for the move by late summer or early fall.

Another priority of the Institution is the Cultural Resources Center of the National Museum of the American Indian which will be completed in late 1998. A reduction in the FY 1999 request will slow down the move of collections from the Bronx facility. However, furnishings, facility and other basic operations support for the 145,000 square foot facility will still be required in order to occupy the building.

Question 3: How would you downsize your individual program increases?

Answer: Depending upon funds made available, we would have to consider slowing down our efforts to digitize the collections. Further, we would need to reduce certain NMAI program increases. See responses to #7 and #8 regarding the priorities for the NMAI request.

Question 4: Please explain why you included both accessibility improvements and the Panama Canal Treaty Implementation in the uncontrollable category?

Answer: The implementation of an extensive five-year plan for accessibility improvements is the direct result of the Americans with Disabilities Act. It is incumbent upon the Smithsonian Institution to address provisions for alternative formats for publications, videos, computer programs; increase access services for interpreters and audio describers; and review, design, renovate and construct facilities that are fully accessible. The projected financial costs to comply with such a vast endeavor are enormous and are outside the control of the Institution.

An array of support services provided to the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) by the U.S. Department of Defense will be terminated as a result of the implementation of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty. The treaty terms and conditions turn the Canal over to the Republic of Panama in December 1999 and will eliminate these services to STRI. The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute will incur costs for services such as mail handling and delivery, vehicle and research fuel, transportation of large equipment, and some medical services which are outside of the control of the Institution.

Question 5: The budget has included increases for several years for Extraordinary Inflation for Library Materials. What is your goal and how many more years do you intend to request additional funds for this purpose?

Answer: By requesting annual increments for three years beyond FY 1999, SIL will increase its acquisitions budget to $2 million. SIL's ability to serve adequately the information needs of Smithsonian staff has been severely compromised by ten years of inflationary increases in book and journal prices. The amount of $2 million will allow SIL to keep up with continuing extraordinary inflation of journal subscription rates and provide a budget consistent with those of comparable research libraries. SIL first received a budget increase to counter this situation in FY 1998.

Question 6: The request includes $425,000 for accessibility improvements. Are all of these specific improvements mandatory requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act?

Answer: All of the improvements listed below are mandatory requirements under the Smithsonian's policy on accessibility (SD 215). This policy follows the standards set by the Americans with Disabilities Act under both Title I and Title III. The funding requested will provide for the following improvements:

1) Funding for accessibility services for staff and visitors with disabilities. These services will allow the Smithsonian to provide effective communication through sign language interpreters, realtime captioning, audio description, Braille texts, and other accommodations.

2) Funding to retrofit existing exhibitions, publications, and audiovisual productions to ensure that they are accessible to people with disabilities. After a comprehensive survey of all of the Smithsonian's museums and the Zoo, program deficiencies such as inaccessible signage, publications not available in alternative formats (i.e., Braille, audio cassette, large print and computer disk), and audiovisual productions without captioning or audio description were identified. This funding will allow the Institution to correct many of these accessibility deficiencies.

3) Funding to support a position to review facility design and construction projects to ensure that all renovation, repair, and new construction create facilities that meet the New Construction Standards set by the Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessibility Design.

Museum of the American Indian

Question 7: The operational request for the Museum of the American Indian provides for an additional $11 million and 89 positions. Please break down this request into all components including actual cost of the move, staff, support services, security, exhibit designs for the Mall Museum etc. Please rank these in priority order.

Answer: The Cultural Resources Center is intended to house the collection, to provide a focal point for the development of programmatic and educational products such as curricula, and for the uses of technology to enhance accessibility to the collection through the use of such tools as the Web site. The $11 million request for FY 1999 includes $1,973,000 to begin the move of the museum's collections and staff from New York to Suitland. Eleven positions have been requested to provide staff support in New York until the move is completed. A total $627,000 is requested to improve the collections information system as the move starts, enabling NMAI to maintain inventory and to take advantage of the collection move to begin to make text and images of the collection available electronically.

Opening the Cultural Resources Center (CRC) requires increases in support services budgets as follows: the Office of Physical Plant 14 staff ($660,000) and $535,000 for utilities; Protection Services 20 staff ($725,000) and $75,000 for supplies; Libraries 2 staff ($99,000) and $22,000 for supplies and material.

The Administration Department requires 17 positions ($735,000) and $176,000 for operating costs to staff and support the facility management services at the CRC. These include custodial and laborer positions, communications network control staff, and facility supervisory and administrative support staff. One-time equipment costs of $2,992,000 will provide computer hardware for the staff work stations, equipment for the laboratories, workshops and resource center, and the necessary administrative equipment at the new facility.

The Cultural Resources Department request includes 9 positions ($470,000) and $167,000 in program funds to augment the curatorial and conservation staff and the data management capability. These resources are needed to meet the increased use of the collection that the new facility will permit. The museum outreach program would be increased by 2 staff ($100,000) and $89,000 in program funds to provide additional Latin American expertise. Approximately one-third of the Museums collection is Latin American.

The Public Programs Department will add 10 staff to be located at the Cultural Resources Center and 4 staff to start the next phase development and design of Mall Museum opening exhibits ($706,000) and $449,000 in related

program funding. The Public Program staff at the CRC will be used to operate a new resource center and provide additional training outreach services. An additional $400,000 will be needed to enter into contract agreements on Mall exhibit work. Work on the exhibits for the opening of the Mall Museum must be expanded now to assure completion by opening date, now projected to be fall of 2002. One of these positions would be used to manage NMAI special non-artifact collections (film, video, photography, etc.) to be housed in the archives center at CRC.

These program services go to the heart of why the NMAI was established and, as such, cannot be given a lower priority. The resources are needed to meet a backlog of demand for access to the NMAI collection that could not be provided in the previous location. The new building provides an opportunity to make full use of the research and program development potential of the collection for the first time. If funding for these needs cannot be provided in full, alternatives would have to be considered. The move of the collection from New York to Suitland could be extended. This, however, would require that the Research Branch in New York be operational longer than planned, with the attendant costs of operating a facility which is deteriorating.

Question 8: If the total amount were not available, what are the most critical items?

Answer: The increased budget is needed to open the Cultural Resources Center. As the Museum's collection is moved to the CRC it is imperative that security and building services be fully available. Both protection and environmental control are essential to the well being of the artifacts to be stored in the building. Of equally high priority is using the new facility to make the collection accessible to the Indian community and to visiting scholars as originally intended. During the five-year move period, the Research Branch at the Bronx cannot be used for collections accessibility needs.

Question 9: What is the estimated total cost of the move over five years?

Answer: The total cost of the move over five years is estimated to be $18.2 million.

Question 10: What is the projected annual operating cost and FTE level for the Suitland facility and the Mall Museum when complete?

Answer: The current estimate of the NMAI operating cost of the CRC at Suitland when the building is fully operational in fiscal year 2000 is $6.2 million, of which $3.4 million are FY 1998 base funds. In addition, SI support costs would total $3.226 million; none are base funds. The estimated annual NMAI operating cost of the Mall Museum in FY 2003 is $10.149 million, of which $5.4 million are

FY 1998 base funds. SI support costs are estimated to be $3.696 million; none are base funds. The estimated operating cost for the three facilities of NMAI is approximately equal to the single facility of the National Museum of American History or the NASM/Dulles facilities.

Question 11: Your justification describes a regular cycle of changing exhibitions at the Heye Center (NMAI) in New York. How many different exhibits have been shown since the opening?

Answer: Following the opening of the Heye Center in October 1994 with two permanent exhibitions and one temporary exhibition, eight temporary exhibits have been shown.

Question 12. What has been the cost for changing exhibits?

Answer: Approximately $650,000 in federal program funds have been used for seven exhibits during 1996 and 1997. This is an average of $93,000 per exhibit.

Question 13: How does this number of new exhibits compare with the standard in the Washington museums for new exhibits?

Answer: The most relevant comparison of exhibit activity between NMAI and Smithsonian museums in Washington would be with art museums, rather than the National Air and Space Museum, the National Museum of Natural History or the National Museum of American History. Generally speaking, the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden annually has on view approximately 3 new major exhibits and 3-4 new small exhibits. The National Museum of African Art has 2-3 new major exhibits and 3 new small exhibits per year. In 1997, NMAI had 2 new large exhibits and 1 new small exhibit at the Heye Center.

Question 14: The budget briefly describes fundraising efforts in fiscal year 1998. Can you explain in some detail the different fundraising efforts, their goals both financially and programmatically?

Answer: The National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) fundraising initiatives established in 1997, in order of priority are:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Complete Capital Campaign for CRC | | $ 7.3 million |
| 2. NMAI Endowment Fundraising | | $25.0 million |
| | Total | $32.3 million |

Question 15: Much of the request for the Suitland move seems to go beyond the actual move itself and basic operational and security needs. Some of these include development of a collections system, expanding research activities and public programs. Why are these needs critical in FY 1999?

Answer: The primary goal of the Museum is to make the CRC, upon opening, fully operational as a center for access to, and a safe environment for, the collection, and the focus for the development of products and services for educational uses throughout the country. To be a fully functioning museum, especially in time for the Mall opening, NMAI needs a collections management system comparable in scope and sophistication to those now being installed at the other Smithsonian Institution museums in order to support not only research, but exhibitions and public programs. The estimated annual expenses for collections management are approximately $1.8 million. The funds requested for costs beyond the move and basic operational and security needs are needed to provide the services for full access to the collection, the development of Mall exhibits, and the focal point for the development of educational materials by the museum. These include curator and museum technician positions in the Cultural Resources Department and resource center specialists in the Public Programs Department. It is important that these positions be filled during FY 1999 in order to provide a fully operational Cultural Resources Center.

Delay in providing the remaining program funds requested would mean that access to the collection will continue to be severely limited and educational services and material at the new facility would be provided on a protracted schedule.

Question 16: Can private funds be used for any of the non-essential needs?

Answer: All of the funding requested should be viewed as essential because it is needed for mandated NMAI programs. The NMAI is currently working to raise funds for the completion of the construction of the CRC to cover costs beyond the federal funds that were provided. In the future, if fund raising efforts are successful, an endowment may be developed to meet the need for special activities beyond the scope of available federal funding. Current fund raising plans include an endowment of $5 million for the Cultural Resources Center.

National Museum of Natural History

Question 17: What is the current status of the East Court move and relocation?

Answer: Equipment, supplies, and contracts for labor are currently being procured for Department of Entomology collections which require major preparation for their move into the new East Court Building. Planning and purchase of some supplies are also in process for the insect specimens that will be relocated to the East Wing Fifth Floor. Departmental employees have prepared an excellent plan for the move into the Court and are themselves beginning office and non-collection preparations for this move. As these preparations proceed, contractors will transfer fragile specimens to new trays with polyethylene liners and/or new drawers in order to prevent damage to them from vibration during their move and to improve the long-term conservation of the specimens. The Museum is in the process of procuring the cabinets and compactors to house the collections. When the East Court Building construction is completed, these cabinets and compactors will be installed.

The remainder of the communications equipment is also being purchased and will be installed as soon as the construction of the building is complete enough for cabling to begin. The building will be thoroughly cleaned in FY 1998, and furnishings will be acquired in order that the offices can be occupied in an orderly fashion after construction is completed.

Question 18: When do you anticipate this move being completed?

Answer: The relocation into the NMNH East Court Building, which will provide space for research and collections activities, including a portion of the Department of Entomology, and public service space for education offices and instructional classrooms, will mostly be completed in FY 1999. A part of this overall project was to relocate the rest of the Department of Entomology to the East Wing Fifth Floor and the Mollusks portion of the Department of Invertebrate Zoology to the West Wing Third Floor. It is currently anticipated that all three moves will be completed during FY 2000. The procurement of supplies and the preparation for these relocations, the largest part of the move costs, must be undertaken the year prior to the move itself.

Question 19: Does the $500,000 increase for the West Court operations satisfy the total need or will additional increases be required?

Answer: Operating funds for utilities, salaries and supplies are for federal responsibilities associated with Discovery Center space. The only increases anticipated in future years will be the inflation for these categories of costs. Experience with actual anticipated operations may result in an adjustment in future years.

Electronic Accessibility

Question 20: Your budget request includes an increase of $3 million for the digitization of collections. Is this a level of effort?

Answer: Yes. The strategy we intend to use is least cost, with special consideration for whole collections. This will result in the maximum number of items being made available to the public for any given amount of funding.

Question 21: There are several ongoing efforts to make the collections and other resources available through new networks and Web sites. Can you describe some of the different projects, their stage of development, and whether there has been private cost-sharing?

Answer: The ARTCIS project of the six Smithsonian art museums will provide the infrastructure for public access to those museums' collections and their associated information. Through a competitive procurement, the museums have selected a single collections information system which is presently being implemented in each museum. Data conversion has been largely completed, key staff has been trained and the hardware necessary to run the system is being installed. Once the museums are up and running with the new system (anticipated to be in the third quarter of FY 1998), the addition of digital images and core data will be greatly facilitated. The system has a fully developed public access module and a Web interface under development. The use of a single system by six Smithsonian museums will contribute significantly to the use of consistent standards for data fields and terminology which is essential for effective public use of multiple collections databases. This initiative has been supported with federal funds from the Institution-wide Information Resources Management Pool.

At the National Museum of American Art (NMAA), several projects are underway. Teachers and students in Nebraska are using NMAA collections for interactive distance learning. The Community Discovered, a project that focuses on the development of curriculum models of engaged student learning by linking technology and the visual arts with other subject areas. It is funded by a U.S. Department of Education Challenge Grant and undertaken in cooperation with Westside Community Schools, eight other Nebraska school districts, four museums, the Nebraska Department of Education, and University of Nebraska, Omaha, *http://nmaa-ryder.si.edu.*

*del Corazon!,* produced by the Museum in conjunction with the Texas Education Network, is a new interactive educational webzine for students and teachers that draws on NMAA's rich collection of Latino art, *http://www.nmaa-ryder.si.edu/webzine/featpage.htm.*

The NMAA is one of 23 founding members of the Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO), a non-profit organization that will provide educational access to a joint multimedia digital library documenting works of the collections of the major North American art museums, ***http://www.amn.org/AMICO.***

At the National Museum of American History, the Smithsonian Without Walls program explores the potential of new technologies to display engaging museum content in inventive, nonlinear formats. It recently released a critically acclaimed prototype for Revealing Things, ***http://www.si.edu/revealingthings***, an innovative exhibition using the latest Web technology and storytelling to showcase objects currently in storage throughout the Smithsonian. Smithsonian Without Walls is entirely supported by non-appropriated funds. In addition, many avenues of fund raising, including partnerships with the private sector, are being explored.

The National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) will soon complete a six-month pilot project, linking digital images of collection objects to their registration records. This successful test prepares the Museum for moving 1 million objects from New York to the Cultural Resource Center (CRC) in Suitland, Maryland. Images of nearly half the 10,000 Carribean and Ecuadorian archaeology collection objects in the test move can be viewed with their records on the NMAI in-house wide area network (WAN) between New York and Washington, DC. The goal is to make the data available on the Internet through the NMAI Web site. As NMAI moves the collection to the Cultural Resources Center over the next five years, the Smithsonian will link images of the entire collection to registration records so interested individuals at remote sites can easily view the complete inventory. (See also, response to Question 15.)

Question 22. Last year and again in this year's budget submission you describe an ongoing effort to seek partnerships and cooperative ventures with the private sector to supplement Federal resources for this effort, what specific progress has been made to date?

Answer: The following are partnerships and cooperative ventures with the private sector.

- IBM has given the Smithsonian a $750,000 grant to enable the digitization and cataloguing of its collections. The grant has as its goal the production of teaching aids. It will also provide the hardware and software (its Digital Library system) to make access to digitized collections possible and to jumpstart the Smithsonian digitization effort.

- Hewlett Packard and INTEL are partners in the development of a new digitization exhibit at the American History Museum. This exhibit will help teach staff and visitors the digitization process. The exhibit will also be the focus of several

digitization projects being carried out throughout the Smithsonian. INTEL, Hewlett Packard, and Polaroid have donated equipment toward this end.

- The Natural History Museum, with its Natural Partners Program, has entered a co-venture relationship with Voyager Expanded Learning in which they will jointly develop Smithsonian-based project-based learning modules for the after-school market. In June, the first unit "Smithsonian/Voyager Ice Age Summer Camp" will roll out in schools all over the United States.

- The Commercial Remote Sensing Program at the NASA Stennis Space Center is funding the development of a weekly science series that will begin this fall. In addition, NASA is supporting the "wiring" of public areas of the Natural History Museum as well as the Naturalist Center, and the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center to enhance the educational links. Also, IBM has granted the Natural Partners Program $50,000 towards the digitization plan related to this program.

- Bell Atlantic, in conjunction with the New York Institute of Technology, is supporting live remote camera feeds at specific program areas in the Natural History Museum, such as the Live Coral Reef, the Insect Zoo, and the Paleo Prep Lab. The University of Texas Houston, Medical Center and Texas A&M Houston, Medical Center have joined forces to develop a broadband, asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) network and curriculum development program for connectivity throughout Texas and specific sites in South America. They have connected Baird Auditorium at the Natural History Museum into an ATM network making it possible to reach a much broader audience with the Baird Programs.

- Teachers, students and administrators from Stark County, Ohio have worked with the Natural History Museum and its scientists over the last year to write and evaluate an earth science curriculum that supports the new Geology, Gems and Minerals Hall and the corresponding Electronic Field Trips. The curriculum is available to a national audience via the Geology, Gems and Minerals Web Site.

National Zoo and Front Royal Facility

Question 23: The budget request for the National Zoological Park mentions that a condition assessment of the Zoo was completed last year which indicates that nearly $65 million would be needed over the next several years to prevent closure of buildings and exhibits. Of that amount, $26 million is represented as critical needs. Can you explain why these facility repairs were not included in the major Repair and Restoration assessment?

Answer: The condition of Mall facilities was represented in the initial Repair and Restoration assessment completed in 1995. The National Zoological Park's (NZP) assessment, with more than 50 facilities or buildings to assess, was not started until

after all of the buildings on the Mall were assessed; and its assessment was not completed until March 1997. It has taken time to digest the information and mesh it with NZP staff assessments and subsequent system failures. The NZP completed the synthesis of information and established priorities, and the FY 1999 budget request reflects those priorities.

Question 24: How many of these projects are of a serious health and safety nature either to the public or the animals?

Answer: None of these deficiencies pose a health or safety threat to the public. The Deer and Tapir areas, Bear Exhibits, Australia Exhibit, Hardy Hoof, the rhino pool at the Elephant House, the Zurich bird cages, and some portions of the Quarantine Facility need attention to prevent health and safety problems in the near future for animals and animal care staff. Failing aquatic life support systems at Seal and Sea Lion Area, if left unaddressed, also could compromise animal health and safety. Absence of some fire detection and suppression systems present similar problems in these and other animal facilities. Funds in the FY 1999 and future budgets will address these deficiencies.

Question 25: The budget submissions for the last several years have not contained increases. If you have known about these critical needs why is the Committee just finding out about these conditions?

Answer: The Smithsonian chose not to submit increases in the FY 1997 budget because the NZP Repair and Restoration assessment was not completed until March 1997. In FY 1998, NZP asked for $6 million for renovation, repair, and improvement, but the increase could not be provided within the constraints of the final FY 1998 request. The President's budget requested $3,850,000. Items not funded in the previous year add to the backlog of future years.

Question 26: When will an analysis be complete on the condition of the Front Royal facilities?

Answer: Since an analysis has never been conducted in the same manner as those that have been done for other Smithsonian facilities, it will take several months to complete a full assessment. It is expected that this assessment will be done by early 1999.

Question 27: Are any initial estimates of the critical repair needs of this facility available?

Answer: The initial estimate of Front Royal's current critical repair needs is $3 million. Critical repairs include adding a central fire alarm system; repair and replacement of the existing sprinkler system; establishing a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) central control system; replacement of failing equipment, site and utilities work; and the overhaul, repair and replacement of failing building structures.

Question 28: Your budget submission only requests funds to update both Master Plans. If there are critical health and safety needs, why were they not included in the request?

Answer: Critical health and safety needs are included within the R&R category of the Zoo's Construction and Improvements Account, since most are existing systems, not new construction or new needs.

Question 29: Please provide a list of all the critical health and safety projects at the Zoo with cost estimates in priority order.

Answer: Most R&R projects at the Zoo are in some way related to the welfare of the animals, particularly some major capital renewal projects and utility system repairs. We are limiting this response to those projects in the categories of fire detection and suppression and access, safety and security.

**National Zoological Park - Rock Creek and Front Royal R&R Fire and Safety Projects**

| ROCK CREEK PROJECTS: | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Fire Detection & Suppression** | ($) | ($) | ($) | ($) | ($) |
| Fire Alarm Maintenance | 40,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Fire Sprinkler Maintenance | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Fire Protection Improvements | | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | |
| **Total, Fire/Rock Creek** | **80,000** | **440,000** | **440,000** | **440,000** | **90,000** |
| | | | | | |
| **Access, Safety & Security** | | | | | |
| Accessibility Improvements | 50,000 | 150,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Asbestos Repair/Removal | 10,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Door Repair/Replacement | 30,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Annual Safety Improvements | | 35,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Security System Maintenance | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| Amazonia: Replace Railings | | 70,000 | | | |
| Bird House Bulk Food Storage | | 20,000 | | | |
| Bird House- Corridor | 20,000 | 50,000 | | | |
| Boiler Rm Ladder | 25,000 | | | | |
| Commissary: Prep Room Flooring | 15,000 | | | | |
| Dumpster Area: Sanitary Drain | | 25,000 | 100,000 | | |
| Security System Evaluation | | 50,000 | | | |
| Security System Improvements | | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 50,000 |
| **Total, Safety/Rock Creek** | **185,000** | **635,000** | **455,000** | **355,000** | **305,000** |
| | | | | | |

| FRONT ROYAL PROJECTS: | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Fire Detection & Suppression** | ($) | ($) | ($) | ($) | ($) |
| Fire Alarm Maintenance | 40,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Fire Protection-master plan&imprmnts. | | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Dorm Sprinklers | | 50,000 | | | |
| Fire Sprinkler Maintenance | | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| **Total, Fire/Front Royal** | **40,000** | **330,000** | **280,000** | **280,000** | **280,000** |
| | | | | | |
| **Safety** | | | | | |
| Fence Maintenance | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Accessibility Improvements | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Demolish failing structures | 50,000 | | | | |
| Dust collection-carpentry shop | | 200,000 | | | |
| Paint Spray Booth | | | 40,000 | 150,000 | |
| Tree Maintenance | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | | |
| **Total, Safety/Front Royal** | **125,000** | **275,000** | **115,000** | **215,000** | **65,000** |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTAL, FIRE AND SAFETY** | 430,000 | 1,680,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 740,000 |

Question 30: Please include projects that if not completed by a particular date will result in the closure of a building or major exhibit.

Answer: Some exhibits inside the Australia Building and the Zurich bird cages are already closed due to these problems. The Deer and Tapir Areas, Australia Building, the Bear Habitat Exhibits, and rhino pool at the Elephant House are also at risk. (Also, see question and answer #24.)

Holt House

Question 31: There is a request for $100,000 to prepare a historic structural assessment of the Holt House. It is the Committee's understanding that this historic structure has not been used since the mid-1980's, is one of the lowest priorities in the entire Zoo system and the Zoo has no particular use for the building. With critical backlog needs in excess of $65 million, why would you ask for funds for this purpose. Please explain in detail.

Answer: In spring 1997, a community group in Adams-Morgan expressed an intense interest in the history of Holt House and its adjacent property. Based on local historical traditions, they asserted that Holt House had been built by slaves; that the Zoo property just to the south of Holt House was the site of a slave cemetery; and that the Zoo, a part of the Smithsonian, was overlooking an important historical relationship

between President John Quincy Adams, an abolitionist, and the mill sites along Rock Creek that once formed part of the Holt House property. Community groups further alleged that the Zoo and Smithsonian were intentionally permitting a historically significant property to go to ruin.

Throughout last spring, Zoo representatives appeared at Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) meetings in the Mt. Pleasant-Adams Morgan neighborhoods and in the Woodley Park-Cleveland Park neighborhoods to explain the Zoo's position on the future of Holt House and adjacent property. The community was especially interested in what the Zoo was planning to do with the area around Holt House and expressed the opinion that neither the Zoo nor the Smithsonian Institution were taking community concerns into consideration in making plans for the property. Articles appeared in newspapers suggesting negligence and indifference to citizen concerns on the part of the Zoo and the Smithsonian.

Last summer, Zoo representatives again went before the ANCs and informed reporters the Zoo had allocated funds from its FY 1997 budget to stabilize Holt House and to prevent further deterioration. In addition, Zoo representatives said additional support would be sought in the FY 1999 budget cycle to finance a historic structures assessment report by architectural engineers. Only then would the Zoo know what options were available with regard to preservation.

In addition, Zoo representatives informed the ANCs and the press that the Smithsonian archivists would begin an intensive and thorough investigation and collection of all documents relevant to Holt House and its history. After five months of concentrated and thorough research, the SI historians produced a 750-page binder that told the story of the historically significant past of Holt House and the surrounding 42 acres.

Relevant highlights of the property's past include the following findings:

- Part of an African-American cemetery was once located on 1.7 acres of Zoo land near Holt House; established in 1871, the cemetery served the post slavery community;

- Although the exact year that Holt House was constructed is undetermined, slaves could have helped build the house sometime between 1809 and 1820;

- John Quincy Adams and his family owned mills situated along Rock Creek close to Holt House (and on present-day Zoo property). Adams and his family were very much involved in running the milling operation for nearly 50 years, from 1823 to 1872.

- By the 1840s Holt House's condition had already begun to deteriorate and after the property was acquired in 1889, the Zoo spent thousands of dollars over the next decade to make the structure usable as an administration building.

As noted above, there have been numerous criticisms from the community requesting that the Holt House structure be protected from neglect and demolition. Therefore, the NZP is asking for the funds to address these criticisms and because the National Historical Preservation Act (NHPA) requires us to have a plan to address historic structures on federal property. Preparation of a Historic Structures Report will allow NZP to be in compliance with meeting these federal requirements and avoid future community criticism.

Major Repair and Restoration

Question 32: With the additional funds provided to you by this Committee for Repair and Restoration of the Smithsonian buildings in most critical repair, what specific progress has been made over the last several years? Please address the most critical health and safety issues?

Answer: The Institution is making progress in ameliorating the most serious facilities deficiencies with increased funding received since FY 1996. The most significant work includes replacing the roof at the American Art and Portrait Gallery Building, replacing the skylights and window walls at the National Air and Space Museum, and continuing major capital renewal at the National Museum of Natural History. The Institution is also actively designing major capital renewal projects at the American Art and Portrait Gallery, the Arts and Industries and the Smithsonian Institution (Castle) buildings. A number of critical life safety and health issues have also been addressed, including about 90% of known requirements for fire protection work (remaining work is incorporated into major renewal projects at several buildings); escalator safety upgrades; and asbestos and lead abatement at numerous locations.

Question 33: What specific projects would be funded with the FY 1999 request? Please distinguish between the most critical health and safety needs and other projects.

Answer: The current plan for FY 1999 includes the following work:

| PROJECT | AMOUNT ($000s) |
|---|---|
| Critical health and safety needs: | |
| Relocate fire protection control consoles, Anacostia Museum | 75 |
| Asbestos abatement and monitoring, misc. locations | 450 |
| Asbestos removal, Silver Hill building 17 | 750 |
| Lead abatement, misc. locations | 250 |
| Escalator safety improvements, misc. locations | 200 |
| SUBTOTAL | $1,725 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Major capital renewal (which includes some life, safety and health work): | |
| National Museum of Natural History | 15,100 |
| American Art and Portrait Gallery building | 1,000 |
| Arts and Industries building | 1,500 |
| Smithsonian Institution (Castle) building | 500 |
| SUBTOTAL | $18,100 |
| | |
| Other planned work by category: | |
| Security and accessibility projects | 3,445 |
| General repair projects | 7,070 |
| Facade repair projects | 4,575 |
| Utility repair projects | 3,085 |
| Advanced planning and design | 2,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | $20,175 |
| | |
| PROGRAM TOTAL | $40,000 |

Question 34. If Congress continues to provide this additional funding, can we be assured that no major museums will be closed?

Answer: The $40 million requested for FY 1999 will provide enough of an increase to allow the Institution to begin a more aggressive program to repair the four buildings in the most serious condition. Early renovation will lessen the risk of major system or equipment failure which would disrupt normal operations of these buildings.

NMAI-Construction

Question 35: The Committee provided $29 million in the fiscal year 1998 bill to begin construction on the National Museum of the American Indian Mall Museum. This year's request is for $16 million in direct appropriation and $19 million in advanced appropriation. Has the $29 million been expended to date? If not, when would you expect that to occur?

Answer: Of the $29 million appropriated in FY 1998 for the National Museum of the American Indian Mall Museum, $3,000 has been obligated as of March 1998. The Institution's current plans are to use approximately $1 million in FY 1998 to begin sitework for the building. The remaining amount, along with funds requested for FY 1999, will be obligated in the construction contract in FY 1999.

Question 36: With all the other pressing needs of the Smithsonian including critical backlog needs of the Museum and the Zoological Park, why is it necessary to have this entire amount in FY 1999?

Answer: Although the language provided in the FY 1998 appropriation would allow the Smithsonian to award the construction contract for the Mall Museum without full funding, we believe it is sound management practice to have full funding for a capital investment. The $16 million requested for FY 1999 represents the amount required to keep the project on schedule, and $19 million advanced appropriation request will complete the project.

Question 37: Assuming this entire amount is not available, what is the minimum amount needed to keep the project on schedule?

Answer: In order to maintain the current construction schedule, the $16 million requested is the minimum amount.

Question 38: The Committee understands that there have been problems between the contractor and the architect. Could you provide specific details on the problem itself and the status or resolution?

Answer: The problem does not stem from a disagreement between a general contractor and the architect. It arises from a disagreement between the architectural team members - the A&E general contractor, GBQC, and the lead designer over their respective responsibilities in the project. The firms also failed to coordinate either their work or the work of the technical subcontractors. As a result, the work fell further and further behind schedule. The 35% design drawings, scheduled for delivery in June 1997, were not delivered until August. Further, the Institution never received the 65% construction drawings scheduled for delivery in December 1997.

The Smithsonian issued a "Cure Notice" on December 23, 1997, requiring that the architects explain their deficient performance and that they provide a project recovery schedule. In response, the contractor requested that the lead designer be removed. In addition they submitted a project recovery schedule that was unacceptable to the Smithsonian. Since the Institution had selected this architectural team based upon the qualities each member brought to the team, it became apparent that the Institution no longer had the benefit of the team it had selected. In addition, the work had fallen so far behind schedule that the Institution had no choice but to terminate the contract with the architectural team.

The Institution terminated the contract for default on January 21, 1998. The contractor has retained an experienced counsel to represent them. Counsel has filed a Notice of Appeal. The contractor will submit materials in support of its appeal to the Smithsonian by April 27, 1998. They have the right to appeal to the Federal Court of Claims if dissatisfied with the Smithsonian's review of the appeal.

Question 39: Did this problem result in any additional costs?

Answer: The termination of the architectural team associated with the project could have an impact on the cost. However, the Institution will take steps to minimize

the impact. One step will be bringing people on board who already have some familiarity with the design, in either the consultative or active roles. Regardless, there will be no need for additional federal funds as a result of this termination.

Security

[Note: Due to the sensitive nature of the information contained in the answers to questions 40 through 43, the Institution has provided the responses for the Committee Files.]

Lease-Purchase Proposals

Question 44: There have been discussions about a possible lease-purchase of the old Hecht Building downtown. As you know, the Committee is reluctant to take on any new operating or maintenance needs until the existing backlog maintenance and other current construction commitments have been met. Can the Committee be assured that no commitment will be made or private funds raised prior to the Committee approving a specific proposal including an analysis of all initial and outyear costs?

Answer: The Smithsonian will fully inform the Committee of its proposals, including cost analyses, prior to making any commitment.

Star-Spangled Banner

Question 45: The Committee understands that discussions have been ongoing with the Pew Charitable Trust concerning a donation of $5 million, to be federally matched, to restore the Star Spangled Banner. What is the status of this negotiation?

Answer: On December 30, 1997, the President of Pew Charitable Trust, Rebecca W. Rimel, informed Secretary Heyman that the Pew Board had given conditional approval of $5 million for the restoration of the Star-Spangled Banner (SSB), with the expectation there would be equal support from the federal government. The Pew Trust met with the Millennium Project staff at White House in January 1998 to discuss items of mutual interest, including the SSB preservation project.

On February 11, 1998, the Pew Trust publicly announced at a press briefing with Hillary Rodham Clinton that a major grant would be made by the foundation. The Trust would grant $5 million to the Smithsonian Institution for the $18 million Star-Spangled Banner project. This grant would be matched with $5 million from public sources. Other donors would contribute the remaining funds.

The week of February 16, 1998, Rebecca Rimel and David Morse of Pew Charitable Trust met with Secretary Heyman to discuss the match of federal funds for

the SSB project and other potential sources of support. The group decided that letters would be written to foundation colleagues in attempt to secure additional partnerships for the project.

Question 46: Should private funds become available, how would this project rank in priority with your current budget request?

Answer: Matching funds to restore the Star-Spangled Banner would be our first priority for support, since it would result in at least $5 million in additional, non-Federal support for this critical project. If the Smithsonian receives some portion of the the President's Millennium Funds request for FY 1999, the Pew Trust would credit a portion of the regular budget that is being used for the Star-Spangled Banner project as part of that $5 million match. The Pew Trust has also indicated assistance in raising additional money from other foundations.

Notification of Closures

Question 47: As you begin extensive maintenance repairs to the museum buildings such as the Air and Space Museum, how are you proposing to notify the public about disruptions of popular exhibits and minimize any inconvenience to the general public?

Answer: Activities are already underway to notify key audiences and the general public about the planned rotating closing of exhibits at the National Air and Space Museum during the three-year project to replace the building's glass walls.

Because of the intense interest in the Enola Gay exhibit, which will close permanently on May 18 (the Enola Gay will be prominently displayed, fully assembled at the museum's planned Dulles Center), veterans' organizations, other groups and individuals and members of Congress have been alerted to the planned closing of this exhibit.

Once a final project schedule is received form the contractors, the news media, including travel writers around the country will be informed. The information will be presented on the Institution's and the Museum's Home Pages on the Internet. The Smithsonian's Home Page receives some 12-14 million hits per month and the Air and Space Museum's site receives 1.19 million contacts per month. In addition, the information will be carried in the Museum's monthly calendar of events, which reaches an audience of 15,000 to 18,000 people per month.

Also, the Smithsonian's visitor information service will include this information in the thousands of visitors information packages it mails out every month and in the immediate responses to the thousands of callers who request information every week. Printed information about the closings will be available at the Information Center in the

Smithsonian Castle and at the information desks of all of the museums. Visitors may also receive this information from the interactive information kiosks in the Castle.

If the National Portrait Gallery and the National Museum of American Art are closed entirely, for any period of time, ample notice will be provided through the news media, the Internet and direct contacts with critical audiences. In addition, the closings will be noted in the Smithsonian's monthly advertisement in the Weekend Section of The Washington Post.

New Partnerships

Question 48: It has been a year since the Smithsonian has begun a new policy of loaning some of the 140 million objects to private museums around the country. How many requests have been made to date and what is the status of your ongoing projects such as Bethlehem Steel?

Answer: Since its inception, the affiliations program has drawn interest from existing and emerging museums nationwide. There has been considerable variety in the size and type of museums from which we have fielded inquiries, informational requests, and exploratory meetings. To date, there have been inquiries from slightly more than 100 organizations representing 30 different states. We send out information about the program to any organization that writes, calls, or e-mails to request it. While it is relatively common for us to receive additional correspondence or contact from those that inquire, it is important to realize that there are many from whom we may never hear back.

As for the status of the program, we currently have eight organizations with which we have signed memoranda of understanding. The memorandum of understanding initiates a period of mutual feasibility studies which may then culminate in the actual implementation of the long-term loans of artifacts. Each relationship will showcase Smithsonian collections, combine a variety of Smithsonian resources, and uniquely reflect the interests and needs of the affiliating organization's local constituency.

The National Museum of Industrial History in Bethlehem, PA was our first affiliating organization. That museum's staff is currently working very closely with individuals at our National Museum of American History on feasibility studies and on the researching and readying of collections. In the next few years, numerous large-scale artifacts (locomotives, steam engines, machinery, etc.) and hundreds of smaller pieces will move to the converted steel mill site on long-term loan.

The remaining affiliating organizations have each only entered the program within the past seven months. All are currently launching into feasibility studies and have been collaborating with appropriate personnel within the museums. Following is a complete list of our affiliating organizations to date:

| | |
|---|---|
| • National Museum of Industrial History | Bethlehem, PA |
| • The Museum of Progress | Scottsdale, AZ |
| • Origins of the Southwest Museum | Arlington, TX |
| • Centro Alameda | San Antonio, TX |
| • Public Corporation for the Arts | Long Beach, CA |
| • Miami Museum of Science | Miami, FL |
| • Bisbee Mining and Historical Museum | Bisbee, AZ |
| • Chabot Observatory and Science Center | Oakland, CA |

Question 49: What specific conditions must be met by these institutions in order to qualify for consideration and then how do you decide which museums will be selected?

Answer: An organization wishing to seek an affiliation must be a U.S. not-for-profit educational organization which has been recognized as such by the Internal Revenue Service under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. In order to be considered for the affiliations program, an organization is required to submit a proposal package. Elements of the proposal package include a) proof of 501(c)(3) tax status, b) a copy of the organization's mission statement and charter, c) description of the organization's structure (including a narrative of responsibilities and qualifications of the museum's permanent staff), d) copies of annual reports and Forms 990 for the past two years, e) a copy of the organization's collections management policy, f) description of the organization's constituency, and g) a description of the objects or types of collections the organization is interested in borrowing from the Smithsonian.

The affiliations program is non-competitive and non-exclusive. We accept each inquiry on its merits. Proposals are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Major elements of the review process include a) the extent to which the proposal is consistent with and furthers current Smithsonian interests and priorities, b) the availability of Smithsonian collections and resources in the areas of interest represented by the proposal, and c) the geographic location of the organization, including the presence or absence of the Smithsonian in the area, the availability of similar collections in the area, the demographics of the area served by the organization, and the cultural impact of the potential affiliation.

Final agreement on the loan of objects is at the discretion of the respective museum directors, and the affiliating organization must be able to demonstrate its ability to care and provide for the collections that would be lent from the Smithsonian. To this end, site visits and the organization's completion of a facility report (assessing the environmental, safety, security, staffing, storage, exhibition space, and insurance capabilities) are necessary.

All Smithsonian expenses related to the affiliations program activities must be borne by the proposing organization. In addition, the proposing organization must

recognize the continuing authority of the Smithsonian Board of Regents over the objects, e.g., the authority to recall any or all of the objects during the loan period.

Question 50: Have you set a realistic goal, based on Smithsonian staff currently available to work on these requests, of how many partnerships can be entered into per year?

Answer: The affiliations office has emerged within the past year. It serves as an initial point of contact for the program and then continues in its capacity as a facilitator for the affiliating organizations. The office offers incoming affiliation proposals to the Smithsonian museums cited in the proposals. It is up to the individual Smithsonian museum to discern its level of involvement with the affiliation, based upon its current level of prior commitments and its resources available.

Air and Space Extension at Dulles Airport

Question 51: Now that the federal funds have been provided for planning and design for the new Air and Space extension at Dulles Airport, what is the status of the State of Virginia commitments and private fundraising efforts?

Answer: The Commonwealth of Virginia recently approved $10 million to begin site infrastructure work at the National Air and Space Museum's Dulles Center during FY 1999.

Virginia has pledged to provide basic infrastructure support estimated at $39.32 million for the Dulles Center, including site clearing, fencing, roadway and intersection construction, utility placement, and other features. Approximately $10 million for the infrastructure is provided in the FY 1999 state budget with additional funds projected in the FY 2000 budget at $10.89 million and in the FY 2001 budget at $12.11 million. An additional $7.07 million from highway funds will be dedicated to the construction of the Route 28/Barnsfield Road interchange. The first site construction contract will be advertised by the Virginia Department of Transportation during spring 1998.

Additionally, Virginia is providing $6.0 million for design and construction of the building, of which $1.0 million has been received ($0.5 million in FY 1997 and $0.5 million in FY 1998). The state's FY 1999 budget projects another $0.5 million for this purpose and it is anticipated that future budgets will provide the balance.

Virginia has also made available an interest-free $3.0 million loan. The Smithsonian has drawn down $1.0 million to date. The Smithsonian is analyzing Virginia's further offer for issuance of up to $100 million in bonds to fund construction.

The Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum has an active capital campaign in its initial stages. The plan is to obtain several major pledges in

FY 1998 for non-federal funds sufficient to warrant the issuance of a bond in early FY 1999 for initial construction. The capital campaign is planned to be announced in the late fall of this year and will continue until sufficient funds are raised. We anticipate that the campaign will be completed in five years.

Business Ventures

Question 52: What is the status of the Regents' efforts to develop new strategies for small business ventures?

Answer: The Regents have formed an ad hoc committee chaired by Senator Howard Baker to review a series of possible organizational structures for the Institution's business ventures. The committee will hold its first meeting in May.

Future Expansions

Question 53: The Committee is aware that the Smithsonian has developed a strategy for fulfilling its Facilities requirements over the next few years. Please provide the Committee with a detailed list of proposed expansions, in priority order. This information should include items such as need, total square footage, estimated cost for construction and additional operational needs and timelines.

Answer: The Smithsonian will be presenting a strategy paper to the Board of Regents in September 1998. For the January 1998 meeting, the Regents were given as background a listing of all possible needs in the future, without providing the full analysis and priority listing. When the Secretary discusses facilities needs, he has noted that of the 4.6 million square feet identified in the background listing as long-range requirements, 1.3 million has already been approved and includes the East and West Courts of Natural History, Dulles Center and the NMAI Cultural Resource Center and Mall Museum.

Of the remaining 3.2 million square feet, 720,000 square feet includes the Hecht Building (235,000 sq.ft.); the Federal Office Building on Independence Avenue, 10-B (251,000 sq.ft.); a building (200,000 sq. ft.) to replace the 1111 North Capital facility; and the 40,000 square foot Nichols School, a potential lease site, located on Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Anacostia. While the balance, 2.5 million square feet, reflects collective aspirations of museums and research institutes, it represents neither the commitment nor the priorities of the Institution.

Question 54: Is it the intention of the Smithsonian to present each of these requests in budget submissions prior to any planning funds being expended or private funds or commitments being made?

Answer: Yes, it is our intention.

Question 55: Your construction table indicates plans to construct a History and Art Support Center in Suitland, Maryland beginning in fiscal year 2000. The total projected cost for this structure is $105 million. Is this another storage facility?

Answer: This facility, in the long-range master development plan completed in 1993 for the Suitland complex, would provide approximately 450,000 square feet of collection storage and care space for the National Museum of American History, the Anacostia Museum, and the five art museums in Washington, D.C. This particular project has not been approved by the Regents. Since development of the master plan, budgetary constraints have placed this project lower on our priority list (see response to Question #53).

Question 56: With the $250 million backlog for all the Smithsonian buildings and as estimated $65 million for the Zoological Park, how can you justify this project so soon after completion of the 3 Museum of the American Indian facilities?

Answer: Like many organizations, the Smithsonian must address multiple obligations and competing priorities. Maintenance, repair and restoration of the historic public buildings it occupies is high among these, as is stewardship of the collections entrusted to it, and the fulfillment of obligations it has undertaken with the express authority of the Congress. The Mall Museum of the National Museum of the American Indian will complete the obligation to provide facilities to preserve and interpret that collection as outlined in PL 101-185. However, the collections of other museums are also seriously overcrowded or are stored in inappropriate conditions, and the current lack of space severely hampers planned collections acquisitions programs that are vital to development and maintenance of coherent collections. We take seriously the stewardship of the National Treasures entrusted to us and consider their continued appropriate care and storage to be of comparable importance to the maintenance of the Institution's facilities.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Authorization (ISTEA)

Question 57: The House ISTEA bill includes an authorization for $5 million to be made available for three years for the Smithsonian Institution. If these funds were made available, how would they be used?

Answer: The targeted needs for the ISTEA funds currently in the House bill at $5 million for 6 years, are as follows:

National Museum of American History

- The Smithsonian's public exhibition halls covering surface transportation in America (the subject of this bill) have not been substantially changed since 1964. A new, long-term exhibition called *America on the Move* is now in planning. It will use state-

of-the-art interactive video technology; Internet links to schools across the country; "long-distance learning" by teleconferencing to high schools, universities, and research institutions; educational outreach to under served schools; programmatic links with other transportation museums in nearly every state; and fresh exhibits that are specifically designed to keep up with the continual advance in transport technology.

- America's treasures - vehicles and artifacts - that document our society as the most mobile on earth are cared for at the Smithsonian's Silver Hill facility. The Institution will upgrade environmental controls in the two buildings at Silver Hill in which historic road and rail vehicles - and new acquisitions - are kept, perform critical stabilization of these artifacts, and improve collections inventory management.

National Air and Space Museum

Funds provided by the ISTEA will allow the National Air and Space Museum the opportunity to:

- Update its air transportation educational outreach and exhibits. This will focus on each age of transportation with the emphasis on aircraft, engine technology, the people of industry, the passenger experience, safety, and the governmental framework.

- The companion educational outreach will focus on electronic outreach, including the World Wide Web. Print materials, suitable for use by schools and other educational venues, will also be included.

- Funds would be available for the conservation, restoration of collections and educational activities at the Dulles Center.

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY REPRESENTATIVE SIDNEY R. YATES

### Renwick Museum

Question 58: I have heard a rumor that there may be a plan to convert the Renwick Museum into a Presidential museum, can you please comment on this?

Answer: There are no plans for changing the program of the Gallery. The rumor that the Renwick Gallery may be turned into a Presidential museum is just a rumor.

### Repair and Restoration

Question 59: The FY99 budget request has an increase of $8 million for repair and restoration. What projects do you intend to address with this increase?

Answer: The increase of $8 million over the FY 1998 appropriation will be applied toward major capital renewal work required at the National Museum of Natural History.

Question 60: Are these your highest priorities of repairs?

Answer: Replacement of aged and deteriorated building systems at the National Museum of Natural History is one of the Smithsonian's highest priorities for use of Repair and Restoration funds.

### National Museum of the American Indian

Question 61: What is the status of the National Museum of the American Indian?

Answer: PL 101-185 provided for three facilities for the National Museum of the American Indian. The George Gustav Heye Center in New York City was completed and opened to the public in October 1994.

The 250,000 square foot Mall Museum is estimated to cost $110 million, and one third of the project cost ($36.7 million) has been raised privately. Congress has provided $9.3 million for the planning and design of this facility, and $29 million to begin construction. The conceptual design was approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Institution is ready to begin construction document development. The current schedule calls for beginning site work in 1998 and actual construction of the building in 1999, with public opening in 2002.

The Cultural Resources Center, now under construction adjacent to the Museum Support Center in Suitland, Maryland, will provide a home for over one million cultural artifacts which are now warehoused and largely inaccessible. Congress provided $40.9 million for the 145,000 gross square foot facility. Completion of the building is scheduled for late 1998.

Holt House

Question 62: What is planned in FY99 for the Holt House?

Answer: Current plan is to prepare the Historic Structures Report in FY 1999 using the $100,000 identified in the FY 1999 budget for Holt House. The report will contain findings and recommendations for future courses of action to be directed toward the disposition of Holt House.

Question 63: Do you have plans to use this facility in the future?

Answer: Future plans for Holt House are dependent upon the findings and recommendation contained in the Historical Structures Report.

Question 64: There have been charges that the Smithsonian is not meeting its historic obligations with regards to the Holt House. Could you please comment on this?

Answer: The chair of the Adams-Morgan Neighborhood Ad Hoc Committee for Holt House has alleged in a letter to the Zoo and via a newspaper article that NZP and the Smithsonian are in violation of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. She believes that NZP and the Smithsonian have not given the public enough opportunity to be involved in the decision-making process regarding Holt House's future and has intimated to NZP staff that insufficient action and indifference on the part of NZP/SI may result in legal action.

The NZP and the Smithsonian believe it has not violated the Act and has written a detailed letter so informing the chair of the Ad Hoc Committee. Smithsonian archivists gave the Zoo a copy of the 750-page binder, which was made available for public perusal in the Zoo's Office of Public Affairs (OPA). In addition, OPA produced a five-page summary of the historical study and distributed copies of the summary to other interested citizens. The five-page summary will also be placed on the Zoo's website.

Community groups have been encouraged by the initial study, which has spurred their insistence that more be done to determine how Holt House can be preserved and the property around it recognized for its historic value. The Zoo will continue to work with the community to understand their concerns.

Operations

Question 65: The FY99 budget request had an increase of $17.5 million over FY98. Why such a large increase?

Answer: When examining the increase of the FY 1999 request over the FY 1998 appropriation, the largest portion is attributable to the Salaries and Expenses account. The FY 1999 S&E request is approximately $23.9 million above the FY 1998 appropriation. The Institution requests a net increase of $10.3 million for mandatory cost increases. The increase in FY 1999 for programmatic requirements, critical to ongoing projects within the Smithsonian, is approximately $13.6 million. This increase is primarily for the costs associated with the move of National Museum of American Indian collections from New York to the Cultural Research Center in Suitland and the Smithsonian's program of digitization of the collections.

The Institution increased its request this year in the Capital accounts to embark on a more aggressive program to repair the four major buildings on the Mall and to address major capital renewal work needed at the Zoo. This represents approximately $8.6 million increase over last year. Finally, the increment of funding requested for FY 1999 for the NMAI Mall Museum construction is substantially less than what was appropriated in FY 1998. This offsets the FY 1999 Smithsonian budget request total with a net reduction of $15 million compared with last year.

Question 66: How much of this increase is for mandatory expenses?

Answer: The total FY 1999 request for mandatory increases is $10,274,000.

ISBN 0-16-056504-9

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES
3 9088 01619 8533